The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CX, No. 3 March, 1944

CONTENTS

Gloriose Regnans. 161

Holy Communion through Coercion. *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 162

The Earliest Liturgical Books. *William J. Lallou* 169

The Appeal to the Emotions in Preaching. (II) *Edmond Darvil Benard* 176

A Letter from St. Jerome. *Paschal P. Parente* 188

The Historical Background of the Council of Trent *Raphael M. Huber, O.F.M. Conv.* 193

The Nature of Gothic Architecture. *Timothy J. Champoux* 203

Spiritual Reading and the Priest. *Bonaventure Schwinn, O.S.B.* 206

An Accusation against School Theology. *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 213

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Color of the Antependium. 223

Hospital Problems. 223

Concerning Christmas Masses. 225

Intentions of Bination Masses. 226

Contents Continued on Next Page

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington (17), D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington (17) D. C.

Published monthly by The Board of Trustees of The American Ecclesiastical Review, from Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves., Baltimore 2, Md. Subscription price: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, January 10, 1944, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Copyright 1944, by The American Ecclesiastical Review

Contents continued from previous page

ANALECTA

On the Custody and the Protection of the Blessed Eucharist in Time of Attack 227
The Case of the Venerable Servant of God, Innocent a Bertio, O.F.M. Cap. 230
The Case of the Venerable Servant of God, Maria Lopez y Vicuna. 230
Recent Pontifical Appointments 231

BOOK REVIEWS

Philosophies at War, *by Fulton J. Sheen* 232
Commentarius in Summam D. Thomae De Deo Uno et Trino, *by Auguste Ferland, S.S.* 233
Forbidden Sunday and Feast Day Occupations, *by Vincent J. Kelly, C.SS.R.* 233
The Rights of Man and Natural Law, *by Jacques Maritain* 235
From a Morning Prayer, *by John M. Haffert* 236
Angel of the Andes, *by Mary Fabyan Windeatt* 236
BOOK NOTES 238
BOOKS RECEIVED 240

FACULTIES
OF THE
MILITARY CHAPLAIN

The Latin text, together with the English commentary on the same, of the Faculties granted to all Commissioned Chaplains of the Armed Forces of the United States and Civilian Auxiliary Chaplains who aid in the spiritual care of the subjects of the Military Ordinariate.

Twenty-five cents per copy

The American Ecclesiastical Review
The Catholic University of America
Washington 17, D. C.

GLORIOSE REGNANS

Five years ago this March, Cardinal Caccia Dominioni announced to the multitude in St. Peter's Square, and to a waiting world, the election of a new Pope. Eugenio Cardinal Pacelli had been chosen the Successor of St. Peter and the two hundred and sixty-second Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth.

On that March day in 1939, God called Eugenio Pacelli to bear the Pontifical Tiara as his Master had once borne a crown of thorns. Pope Pius XII has looked out in sorrow from the Vatican across a world of cruelty, devastation, suffering and death.

We who are Catholics thank God for His goodness in giving us such a leader for the dark days through which we have passed. Pius XII has reigned gloriously. To nations rent asunder by hatred he has preached the love and the unity to be found in the Mystical Body of Christ. In the midst of cynical power politics and brutal oppression of the weak he has raised a fearless voice in defence of justice and of human rights. He has striven endlessly to bring peace to a world tortured by the bestial futility of war.

His labors for God and God's creatures have brought upon him the calumny and opprobrium of those who flaunt (and of some who endeavor to hide) their enmity for Jesus Christ. But from those who love justice, he has earned admiration and love. And those who are privileged to be members of the Catholic Church have been proud to acknowledge him as their teacher and leader, father and guide.

We should pray, on this his fifth anniversary, that Divine Providence may continue to give the Holy Father strength to carry on his work. He has witnessed destruction worse than any wrought by the Vandals; God grant that he be spared the sorrow of seeing the Eternal City laid waste. We should pray also that his voice may be heard in the making of a new peace. The world can neither ignore nor dispense with the truth he is commissioned to expound.

THE EDITOR.

HOLY COMMUNION THROUGH COERCION

The history of the Church records instances in which Christians, through excess of zeal, made use of threats and even of physical force to compel unbaptized persons to receive the sacrament of regeneration.[1] Of course, such a procedure was illicit, though Baptism was validly received in the event that a person subjected to coercion internally consented to be baptized, preferring this to the inconveniences that would befall him if he manifested a refusal.[2] The Code now expressly forbids the baptism of an adult, unless he is "knowing and willing."[3]

Cases of the forcible persuasion of a man to accept episcopal consecration also occurred in the early centuries, when the Christians of a city were so anxious to have a certain holy and capable individual for their spiritual ruler that they literally dragged him to the altar to be consecrated.[4] Such vehement measures are no longer employed, nor are they necessary in order to replenish the ranks of the hierarchy, although at times the Pope gives a priest a formal command to accept the episcopal office.

However, a milder form of unjustifiable coercion in connection with the reception of Holy Communion is sometimes employed even today, particularly by those charged with the spiritual care of children. Parents are sometimes guilty of this fault, but priests and teaching nuns are especially liable to exceed the bounds of prudence in urging boys and girls to approach the Holy Table frequently. The consequence of this immoderate zeal may be, not merely the habit of communicating through routine, but even the unworthy reception of the most august sacrament. The Church, ever solicitous both for the welfare of souls and for the reverence due the Holy Eucharist, has provided us with safe norms for our guidance, not only through the general principles of Catholic theology, but also through an explicit and detailed pronouncement of the Holy See on this particular subject.

On December 8, 1938, the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments issued an Instruction directed to bishops and religious superiors, on precautions to be taken against abuses liable to happen in connection with daily communion. The Instruction is concerned chiefly with religious, seminarians and young people living in colleges or other institutions, among whom there is a general custom of receiving the Holy Eucharist every day. The chief abuse against which the Instruction is directed is stated thus: "It can happen that some one, though conscious of grave sin, may yet approach the Holy Table influenced by the example of his associates and moved by the vain fear that if he stays away he will cause astonishment in the others, especially in his superiors, and will be suspected of having committed a grave sin."

---

[1] Cf. McSorley, *Outline History of the Church*, pp. 197, 198, 266.

[2] Cf. St. Thomas, *In IV Sent.*, dist. 6, q. 1, a. 2.

[3] Cf. Can. 752, 1.

[4] Cf. Pourrat, *Theology of the Sacraments*, pp. 356 sq.

The Instruction then prescribes that preachers and spiritual directors, when they exhort the faithful, particularly the young, to frequent and daily communion, shall inform them that daily communion is not obligatory and that it may not be practised without the concurrence of the necessary dispositions. Explicit directions are given to bishops and superiors on providing sufficient opportunity for those living in community to go to confession, and on safeguarding liberty of conscience in this matter. The superior of each community is to make it very plain to his subjects that in general he is much pleased with their frequent approach to the Holy Table, but that he has no word of reproach for those who do not receive. He is to give no indication that he seems to notice those who go to communion frequently, and to praise them while blaming the others.

Of special practical value to priests engaged in the parochial ministry is the ruling that even outside communities the expression "general communion" should either not be used at all, or it should be used only in the sense that all are invited to the Holy Table, but nevertheless each individual is entirely free to abstain from it. The Instruction adds: "When Holy Communion is being received, all those things are to be avoided which create greater difficulty for a young person who wishes to abstain from Holy Communion, but in such a way that his abstinence will not be noticed; hence there should be no express invitation, no rigid and quasi-military order in coming up, no insignia to be worn by those who receive Communion, etc."

The Instruction ends with an exhortation to bishops and superiors to add to the remedies which it proposes any others which they may find suitable in the particular circumstances, to the end that the Most Blessed Eucharist, instituted by God for the progress and spiritual welfare of souls, may not, through the malice and negligence of men, be turned to the detriment and eternal ruin of souls.[5]

---

[5] Cf. Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest*, Vol. II (1943), pp. 208 sq.

The following are suggested as practical applications of this Instruction to the reception of Holy Communion by children, in view of conditions prevailing in our country:—

1. A group of children, such as the pupils of the parochial school assisting at Sunday Mass, should not be required to approach the communion rail in such a manner that any child who does not wish to receive is embarrassed or tempted to join the others through human respect. As is evident from the Instruction, the most desirable procedure is to permit those children who intend to receive Holy Communion to come up to the rail without any set order or grouping, as adults are accustomed to do. Such a system—or lack of system—is certainly possible for children as well as for adults in a church in which the number of children is comparatively small. Where there is a large group—as in a parish with a parochial school of 1000 children—some order of receiving would seem to be called for to avoid the inevitable confusion of youngsters pushing and crowding one another at the communion rail, coming back to the wrong pews, etc. But if some system is deemed necessary, the children should frequently be reminded of their complete freedom to communicate or to abstain. The nuns who supervise the children and direct their approach to the altar should fully realize that any manifestation of displeasure toward a child who does not communicate, or even a mere look of surprise, is strictly forbidden.

2. Membership in a society should not be dependent on the regular reception of Holy Communion. A day can be assigned for a group communion of the society, but no attempt should be made to discover and to record who have received Holy Communion and who have not. To expel from a sodality those who do not approach the altar regularly —for example, once a month—would certainly be alien to the spirit of the instruction. At most, such a drastic measure could be taken in the case of one who is publicly known to have missed his Easter duty, but even in such an event great caution is necessary, since, as the Instruction warns us: "Even the obligation of Paschal Communion is modified by the clause 'unless by advice of his own priest, for some reasonable cause the person judge that he should abstain from it for a time' (Can. 859, 1)." Sometimes, it is true, pious societies have rules prescribing that the members shall receive Holy Communion on certain days or at least once a month. Now, in the famous decree of Pope Pius X on daily communion it is stated that when the rules of a religious order enjoin the reception of the Holy Eucharist on certain days "these rules are to be considered merely directive and not preceptive."[6] *A fortiori*,

---

[6] Decr. *Sancta Tridentina Synodus*, No. 8. (A. S. S., Vol. 38, p. 405.)

rules of this nature for a society of lay Catholics are to be regarded as not imposing any obligation, and consequently as not entailing any penalty if a member does not abide by them.

3. Temporal rewards should never be given, either to individual children or to groups, for frequent reception of Holy Communion. The priest who promises a book or a rosary to every child that receives the Blessed Eucharist daily for a month is acting imprudently, to say the least. In some parochial schools it was formerly the custom to count the number of Holy Communions received by the children of each class in the course of the week and to give the class having the highest record a banner, to be kept in the classroom the following week. It is to be hoped that such a custom is now entirely abolished, for it is surely opposed to the norms of the Instruction. As an incongruous consequence of this custom it not infrequently happened that children who received Holy Communion every day of the school year did not approach the altar even once in the course of the three months' vacation. Apparently these children regarded attendance at Mass and Holy Communion as a kind of game, with a prize for the winning team.

4. Any public questioning or correction of individual children concerning the frequency of their Communions must be shunned. Thus, a priest would not be allowed to enter a classroom on Monday morning and ask all who had received Holy Communion the previous day to stand up. Even if no explicit reproach is directed against the others, the procedure itself involves some embarrassment for them. It is incredible that a priest or nun should publicly ask a child why he did not receive or to reprove him for not doing so.

5. The priest must be particularly careful not to give occasion for unworthy Communions among the altar-boys or even for merely routine communions. In choosing boys to serve in the sanctuary, it would seem lawful to regard as one of the determining norms fervor and frequency in receiving the Holy Eucharist. For one of the qualifications of a good altar-boy is piety, and frequent and devout reception of Holy Communion is an ordinary manifestation of genuine piety. But once a boy has been appointed to serve at the altar, the priest must guard against unduly influencing him to receive Holy Communion from some less worthy motive. For example, in some churches the altar-boys are rated in excellence according to a definite system of credits. They receive a certain number of credits for punctuality, for neatness, for the proper recitation of the responses, etc., and eventually the boy with the best record gets a prize. Now, such a system is perfectly lawful, provided it does not include credits for Holy Communion. The

boy who receives daily should not be given any more credits on this account than the boy who receives only a few times in the year. The Instruction states that even in judging the piety of candidates for the priesthood, no account should be taken of their greater or less assiduity in receiving the Blessed Eucharist.[7] Certainly, in the far less important matter of determining the merits of altar-boys, the number of their Holy Communions must not be taken into consideration.

When the priest is training a group of altar-boys for some function at which it can be expected that many of them will receive Holy Communion, such as the Mass of Christmas or Holy Thursday, he should not rehearse the ceremony in such wise that it will not run smoothly if some of the boys abstain from Communion—for example, by assigning particular boys as partners to approach the altar together. He should simply explain, or rehearse in a general way, the ceremony that will take place for any who wish to receive Holy Communion. By his speech and manner he should make it evident to the boys that it will be nothing surprising or extraordinary if some do not communicate.

6. A school examination in Christian doctrine should never contain any such question as: "How often have you received Holy Communion in the course of the past month?" A child has no obligation to answer such a question. An even more unpardonable fault than proposing a question of this nature would be to give the child a favorable or unfavorable mark on the basis of the number of Holy Communions reported.

Up to the present we have considered the means that may not be lawfully employed to induce children to practice frequent Communion. What measures may be used to attain this end? Evidently the Church regards some forms of persuasion as permissible and even commendable, for the decree of Pope Pius X on children's Communion prescribes: "Those who have the care of children shall make every effort to see to it that after their First Communion these children shall approach the Holy Table often, even daily if possible."[8] From this same decree[9] and from the Code[10] it appears that those mentioned as having the care of children are the parents (or guardians), the confessor, the teachers and the pastor.

Certainly, priests and teachers, in their sermons and instructions to children in a group, may earnestly exhort them to the practice of frequent and even daily Communion, pointing out the advantages of this pious custom. At the same time, according to the admonition of the instruction, they should make it clear that there is no strict obligation to receive Holy Communion beyond what is prescribed by the Church in the Code,[11] and constantly remind the young people of the conditions required for a worthy reception of the Blessed Sacrament. The confessor in the tribunal of Penance can urge an individual child, whose dispositions are known to him, to more frequent Holy Communion. He can and should endeavor to dispel unsound reasons to the contrary, which may be in the child's mind, such as unnecessary anxiety about his worthiness, fear of what his companions may say, etc. But even in confession it would not be advisable—at least ordinarily—to impose the reception of Holy Communion as an obligation, apart from what the Church itself commands.

---

[7] Cf. Bouscaren, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

[8] Decr. *Quam Singulari*, VI. (A. S. S., Vol. 2, p. 582.)

[9] Cf *Ibid.*, IV.

[10] Cf. Canon 860.

Similarly, there is no reason why parents, teachers and the priest (even outside the sacrament of Penance) should not prudently exhort an individual child to approach the Holy Table more frequently. This must be done privately, of course, and with due regard for any considerations of conscience which are known only to the child and to his confessor. With these qualifications, a kindly exhortation, particularly in the case of a very young child who needs much guidance, should be free from the undesirable consequences against which the Church so earnestly warns us.

Pastors and other priests having the supervision of parochial schools should make it a matter of conscience that the teachers do not offend against the prescriptions and the spirit of the Instruction. A good, zealous nun may be imprudent in her desire to see her pupils frequently approach the communion rail, and may consequently do considerable harm, despite her excellent intentions.

In fine, children should be induced to practice solid Catholic piety, and particularly to receive Holy Communion frequently, in such a manner that they will realize that progress in virtue is a matter of their own co-operation with divine grace. Even the youngest must be brought to see that every human being has a personal obligation to save his soul and to employ by his own volition the means to that end. External pressure can produce external acts, but of itself it cannot arouse the dispositions of mind and heart that are the essence of Catholic piety. The Catholic Church, aided by the experience of centuries and the special assistance of the Holy Ghost, has given us, in the Instruction which we have been considering, safe norms for the avoidance of externalism, hypocrisy and irreverence in the matter of frequent Communion and for the fostering of genuine devotion, particularly in the young, toward the Most Blessed Sacrament of the Altar.

---

[11] Cf. Canon 859, 864.

Washington, D. C. FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

THE EARLIEST LITURGICAL BOOKS

When, in our article of last month, we defined liturgy as the official worship of the Church as commanded and regulated by her, we indicated as the readiest index to determine whether a particular function is, strictly speaking, part of the liturgy that it be found in one of the official service-books of the Church: the Missal or the Breviary, the Ritual or the Pontifical. Obviously, this test applies only to that section of the history of the Church, in which liturgical books have been in existence. Indeed, it is entirely applicable only to the period following the Council of Trent, since before that time liturgy was still in a more or less fluid state and absolute conformity with the Roman use did not yet exist throughout the Western Church.

Scholars divide liturgical history into four ages: first, the primitive period, extending over the first four centuries of the Christian era; second, the time of the development of ceremonial worship, identical as to general type but with much diversity in details, which period would extend to the late eleventh century; third, beginning with the eleventh and lasting well into the sixteenth century, the epoch, in the West, of the growing, universal adoption of the Roman Rite but with many local variations; fourth, and finally, the time since the Council of Trent, marked by absolute conformity with the usage of Rome, maintained by the required following throughout the Patriarchate of the West, of the official service-books.

There are no books extant containing prayers and ceremonies, dating from the first four centuries. It is doubtful whether such books ever existed. Authorities generally agree that the only book then used in divine services was the Holy Scriptures. The prayers which were recited were at first extemporaneous, (though they inevitably became crystallized in definite forms), and were handed down from one generation to the succeeding one by word of mouth before they were committed to writing. We have accounts of Christian worship, like the celebrated one in the *Apology* of St. Justin Martyr, of the second century, but no texts of prayers have come down to us until we reach the end of the fourth century, the work entitled *De Sacramentis*, now generally acknowledged as of Ambrosian authorship.

We have, indeed, before this time, fragments, but only fragments, of liturgical texts. There is, for example, from the early third century, the *S. Hippolyti Traditio Apostolica*, which contains a Preface; the words of Institution, an *Anamnesis*, and an *Epiclesis*. There are the tattered leaves of the *Deir-Balizeh*, a papyrus, so called from the place in Egypt where it was found, dating from the third, or, at latest, the fourth century, with the words of a pre-consecratory *Epiclesis* and an *Anamnesis* of the death and resurrection of our Lord. Similar fragments of liturgical texts are extant in sources like the Egyptian *Anaphora S. Marci*, a damaged papyrus of the late third or early fourth century, the *Euchologium Serapionis*, another Egyptian ordinal of more or less the same period as the *Anaphora S. Marci*, the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, a Syrian compilation of *circa* 400 A.D., and the so-called *Testamentum Domini*, another text of the fourth century. All these, however, are not only fragmentary but no one of them, with the possible exception of St. Hippolytus, is Roman. True there was identity in essentials throughout the Church, but great variety in the text of the prayers as they are found in documents, originating in different sections of the great patriarchates.

For the Roman Liturgy, our first actual text of prayers is found in the late fourth century. The *De Sacramentis* of St. Ambrose quotes a pre-consecratory prayer similar to our *Quam oblationem*, goes on with the words of Institution, and concludes with a prayer which combines phrases of our *Unde et memores*, *Supplices te rogamus*, and *Supra quae propitio*, in this order. The words of this section of St. Ambrose's treatise are familiar to all clergy in major orders as they are read in the second nocturn on the Wednesday during the octave of Corpus Christi.

The *De Sacramentis*, however, is not a service-book. It is a work containing instructions on Baptism, Confirmation, and the Holy Eucharist, destined for the newly-baptized. It follows closely another treatise, quite universally acknowledged as the composition of St. Ambrose, the *De Mysteriis*. The excerpts from what we should now call the Canon of the Mass are given simply as quotations. The *De Sacramentis* itself was not destined for use by the celebrant at the Holy Sacrifice.

For the actual text of the Mass in a service-book we must wait for the great Sacramentaries, of which the earliest one extant is the Leonine Sacramentary, whose date is usually assigned to the seventh century. A Sacramentary, it may be useful to note, means a book which contains only what belongs to the celebrant at a liturgical function. The Sacramentary included not only the prayers to be said at

Mass but the celebrant's part in other services: Baptism, ordination, various blessings and exorcisms. Originally, the celebrant at Mass read only the part assigned to him, without repeating, as is incongruously done at Solemn Mass to-day, the parts belonging to deacon and sub-deacon and choir. In the original arrangement, each person participating in the service had his own book, containing only his own part. So, the celebrant had the Sacramentary, the deacon and sub-deacon had the books of lessons, and the choir had its *liber antiphonarius* or *liber gradualis*.

With the development of Low Mass, where the priest has to take all the parts of the sacred drama, and the reaction of Low Mass on High Mass, resulting in the illogical repetition by the celebrant of what is chanted by the ministers or sung by the choir, all the various books used at Mass were combined for greater convenience into one volume, which came to be called the Missal, the *Missale plenum*.

Our earliest complete sources for the text of the Roman Mass are the three great Sacramentaries: the Leonine, the Gelasian, and the Gregorian. The names of the Popes by which these three are known does not imply authorship by St. Leo the First, Gelasius, or St. Gregory the Great. No one of the manuscripts of these Sacramentaries dates from less than a century after the time of the Pontiff by whose name it is known. The *Sacramentarium Leonianum* is extant in a manuscript, commonly dated as of the early seventh century. It was discovered in the Chapter Library at Verona by Joseph Bianchini, who published it in Vol. IV of *Anastasius Bibliothecarius*. (*Editio princeps*, Verona, 1735.) The codex is a sizeable book, with pages 9½ by 8¾ inches, and is still in the library at Verona. Unfortunately, this Sacramentary is only fragmentary, the most interesting portions being missing, as it lacks the Canon of the Mass and the text of the Masses from January to the latter part of April.

The second of the great Sacramentaries is the *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*. There are three manuscrips of this important service-book. The oldest version is the Vatican MS (*Reginae* 316) now in the Vatican Library in the valuable collection presented by Queen Christina, of Sweden. This book is rated as of the late seventh century. The *Codex Rhenaugiensis* (Rheinau 30) is an eighth century manuscript, which reposes in the Kantonsbibliotek, in Zurich. The St. Gall copy (*Codex Sangallensis* 348), in the Stiftsbibliotek, in St. Gall, is of the later eighth century, though ascribed by some to the beginning of the ninth century. The salient feature of the Gelasian Sacramentary is that it has the Canon complete and practically word for word identical with the Canon of the Mass in present-day Missals. The name of Pope Gelasius does not appear in the original manuscripts, which are entitled simply *Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae*, though where portions of it are reproduced in early liturgical books, it bears the name of Gelasius. Thus, in the Stowe Missal, the Canon of the Mass is entitled: *Canon dominicus papae Gilasi* (sic).

The third and most recent of the great Sacramentaries, though it is called that of Pope St. Gregory the Great (590–604) and is considered to represent a Gregorian revision of the Gelasian text, is not extant in any manuscript older than over a century after the death of St. Gregory. This Sacramentary is in four books. The first contains the *Ordo Missae*, so that the Canon of the Mass is in the very beginning of the book and not more or less mid-way, as in the Missal to-day, or in Gelasian Sacramentary, where it appears in Book III. The second book has the ordination ceremonies and Book III has the Proper for the year. The final book adds prayers, blessings, and Votive Masses. There is no complete codex extant of the pure Gregorian Sacramentary, the existent ones being Gallican revisions of the original service book which was sent by Pope Adrian I to Charlemagne in 791 for use in the Frankish kingdom. The first revision was in the shape of a supplement, generally attributed to Alcuin, clearly separated from the Roman book by a *praefatiuncula*. Other supplements followed and then the supplements became inseparably fused with the original. The chief manuscripts are those in the Vatican Library: *Codex Ottobonianus* 313, an early ninth century book with Alcuin's supplement, and *Codex Reginensis* 337, of the later ninth century, representing the Gregorian manuscript with Gallican additions. This latter codex which also belongs to the collection donated by Queen Christina, has the finest illuminations of any of the old Sacramentaries. There is a third manuscript, *Codex Cassinensis* 271 *al.* 348, a palimpsest discovered by Dom André Wilmart at Monte Cassino. Unfortunately, this codex is only fragmentary but it is the oldest example of the text, dating from *circa* 700 A.D. and hence long before any Gallican revisions.

These oldest texts of the Mass, being Sacramentaries and not Missals, give us only the prayers recited by the celebrant, such as the Canon and the orations, and not the Epistles and Gospels and the parts chanted by the choir. Only indications and no text appear for those sections of the Mass not included in the Canon and these only in the *Ordo Missae* of Gregorian Sacramentary and not in the Leonine or Gelasian books. If we should inquire concerning the antiquity of the prayers which are today recited by the celebrant at Mass, the variations would cover fifteen centuries. The prayers at the foot of the altar, originally of medieval composition, were private prayers left to the devotion of the priest until they were made of general obligation with the publication of the Missal of Pius V in 1570. The *Aufer a nobis* is a collect from the Gelasian Sacramentary and the *Oramus te, Domine* is the survivor of several medieval forms of the same prayer. The Introit, a processional hymn, sung as the clergy came to the altar, was of early origin and its introduction has been ascribed to Pope Celestine I (422–432). The *Kyrie* is said to be of Antiochene origin, brought to Rome in perhaps the sixth century. The *Gloria in excelsis*, again, comes from the East and appears in the Roman Mass in the fourth, or, more likely, in the fifth century. The collects take us back to the earliest times, though they are not mentioned in the second-century account of the liturgy, written by St. Justin Martyr. The Epistle and Gospel as parts of the Mass carry us back to Apostolic times being mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul as features of the primitive Christian *synaxis*. The Gradual and Tract also date from the earliest ages, which were the heirs of the practice of the synogogue service of alternating the readings from Scripture with the singing of psalms. The *Munda cor meum* came much later into the Mass. The first witness for it seems to be the *Ordo Romanus XIV*, of the fourteenth century. We know almost the exact date of the introduction of the *Credo* into the Roman Mass. It was decreed to be sung at Mass in Rome by Pope Benedict VIII in the first quarter of the eleventh century.

Passing now to the Mass of the Faithful, the Offertory is of course the vestige of the chant sung by the choir to occupy the time required for receiving the oblations of the clergy and people and so it is almost as ancient as the practice of presenting offerings at this point, antedating certainly the time of St. Augustine. The offertory prayers at the oblation of the bread and the chalice and the similar ones found at this moment of the Mass are all medieval in composition and represent Gallican, i.e. Western but non-Roman, influences in the liturgy. The real offertory prayers are the Secrets and they are of equal antiquity with the collects, to which they correspond in number and order.

The Preface and the Canon, to which the Preface is the introduction, are the oldest text of the Mass. The words of institution are from the

Gospel itself and many of the phrases of our Prefaces echo liturgical forms of even the first century. We have noted above the considerable fragments of the Canon, quoted in the fourth-century *De Sacramentis*, and we have called attention to the practically word-for-word identity of the Canon in the Gelasian Sacramentary, which must be regarded as appreciably older than its seventh-century manuscript, with the Canon of the Mass in the Roman Missal at present. This brings us to the *Pater noster*, of whose antiquity there can be no question, and the expansion of its final petition, technically known as the Embolism, of which we have examples in the Eastern rites, an argument which places its date before the Christological heresies of the fourth century. The breaking of the Host carries us back to the Biblical account of the Last Supper and it was so prominent a feature in early celebrations of the Holy Eucharist that the first name which we meet to designate what is now called the Mass is "the breaking of bread." The *Agnus Dei* was introduced into the Mass to fill up the time occupied by the rite of fraction, which originally was long and complex, for each communicant received a fragment which broken off another portion of the Sacred Species. The text of the *Agnus Dei* is at least as old as the Gregorian Sacramentary. The prayers before the Holy Communion of the celebrant as well as those incidental to his receiving of the Sacred Species and those accompanying the ablutions were at first private prayers of the priest, which became crystallized into our present forms in late medieval times.

The brief section of the Mass following the Communion of the celebrant and people is now introduced by a verse, which we call the Communion. It is the remaining vestige of the more lengthy chant which used to be sung during the long ceremony of Holy Communion, when every cleric and every layman present at the Holy Sacrifice received, and received under both kinds. The Post-Communion, a prayer of thanksgiving recited in the first person plural for all who have partaken of the sacred mysteries, dates, like the collects and the secrets from very early times. A form of dismissal, like our "Ite missa est," is found in our most ancient liturgical texts. It is mentioned even in the Apostolic Constitutions, of the fourth century, where the form is: "Go in peace." The *Placeat* is a medieval form of prayer and the blessing is the survival of the practice of the Pontiff, after High Mass in Rome, of pausing and blessing the people as he started away from the altar. The Last Gospel is a comparatively recent addition to the Mass. It was not regarded as part of the Mass until it became of obligation with the Missal of 1570. The priest used to recite it as a private prayer of thanksgiving as he left the altar on his way to the sacristy.

This very summary consideration of the age of the prayers of the Mass has aimed to give only very generic notions as to the time of their introduction into the text of the Missal. Every effort has been made to keep the statements concerning them accurate but the rapid sketch, which was all that was intended in this article, of its nature has precluded discussion of any of the moot points respecting the antiquity of the prayers in question. At all events, it is no less than thrilling to the celebrant of Mass when he realizes that in pronouncing the words of the liturgy, he is using expressions, some of which were first voiced by our Lord Himself; some dating from Apostolic and post-Apostolic times; few more recent than early or mid-medieval times; and the latest of them long current at the altar at the time that Christopher Columbus made his momentous voyage across the Atlantic.

Washington, D. C. WILLIAM J. LALLOU.

THE APPEAL TO THE EMOTIONS IN PREACHING

PART TWO

In the last issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* we submitted the following three principles, upon which we believe the appeal to the emotions in preaching should be based:

1. A sermon, in order to arouse emotion, must present a good to be gained or an evil to be avoided.
2. The good to be gained or the evil to be avoided must be one which personally affects the hearers.
3. The speaker must clothe his presentation of the subject matter in terms which appeal to the imagination,—that is, in terms which are "picture words," particular, vivid, and concrete.

We maintained, in Part One of this study, that these three principles are logical practical conclusions which may be deduced from the traditional Scholastic teaching on the nature of emotion.

In the present article we propose to examine some actual specimens of the art of sacred oratory, with reference to the principles outlined above. It is also our intention to compare these principles with certain ancient and modern theories concerning the appeal to the emotions in eloquence.

THE APPEAL TO THE EMOTIONS: THEORY AND FACT

We believe that the theory presented in last month's issue of the *Review* may be confirmed through the study of outstanding examples of the appeal to the emotions in the literature of sacred eloquence. We cannot, of course, attempt here an inductive proof based upon a representative number of instances; that would be at best a weary process and, we fear, an imposition on the patience of the reader. We intend merely to consider two classic sermons whose emotional impact on their hearers has been recorded in history; and to determine what they contain and how it is expressed. If our findings support the principles at which we have arrived by a theoretical process, we shall have, not an *a posteriori* proof of the theory, it is true, but at least some indication that the principles we have outlined do not collapse when confronted with factual data however limited in scope.

A. *Jean-Baptiste Massillon's sermon "On the Small Number of the Elect"*

Of all the pulpit orators of that great age when the chapels of France rang to the eloquence of Bossuet and Bourdaloue, Jean-Baptiste Massillon, Bishop of Clermont, is generally conceded to have been master *par excellence* of the art of emotional appeal. The famous peroration of his sermon *Sur le petit nombre des êlus* represents perhaps his outstanding triumph in stirring the emotions of his hearers.

The sermon was preached before the court of Louis XIV at Versailles during the Lenten season of 1704. Since it had been delivered once before at the church of Saint-Eustache, the king and his courtiers had been informed of its emotional climax and, while eagerly awaiting the celebrated passage, were also more or less prepared for it. But Massillon, Frédéric Godefroy tells us, succeeded in touching the hearts of his hearers as if the sermon had been entirely new; and its emotional effect surpassed even that produced by the famed discourse of Bossuet at the funeral of the Duchess of Orleans.[1] Dusseault relates as a matter of common knowledge that the members of the congregation were so overwhelmed by their emotion that they rose spontaneously to their feet.[2]

Massillon had taken as his text the verse from St. Luke: "And there were many lepers in Israel in the time of Eliseus the prophet: and none of them was cleansed but Naaman the Syrian." He stressed the sinfulness of men, and the difficulty of salvation in the corrupt environment of a world whose maxims and customs were incompatible with a truly Christian life. Then, almost at the end of the sermon, came the passage so profoundly moving:

> I confine myself to you, my brothers, you who are here assembled. I say nothing of the rest of men; I regard you as if you were alone upon the earth. And this is the thought which holds me in a grip of horror: I suppose that this is your final hour, and the end of all the universe; that the skies open above your heads; that Jesus Christ appears in glory in the middle of this very temple; and that you are gathered here to await Him,—trembling like criminals before Him who will pronounce upon you the sentence of pardon or of eternal death. For delude yourself as best you can, you will die as you are this day. . . .
>
> I ask of you, and I ask it stricken with terror, making no distinction between my lot and yours. . . . I ask you this: if Jesus Christ were to appear

---

[1] Cf. *Oeuvres Choisies de Massillon*, Paris, Garnier Frères, 1868, tome premier, pp. 20–21.

[2] Cf. Jean Joseph Dussault, *Annales Littéraires*, Paris, chez Maradan et chez Lenormant, 1818, tome troisième, p. 265.

in this temple, in the midst of this assemblage, of all the universe the most distinguished, to pronounce judgment upon us,—to perform the awful cleavage between sheep and goats—do you think that most of us would be placed upon His right hand? Do you think that the division would be at least in equal numbers? Do you think that He would find here even ten just men, whom the Lord of old could not discover in five cities all together?

I ask you this, and you do not know the answer. I know it not myself. Thou alone, my God, know those who are Thy children. But if we do not know who are the Lord's, at least we know that His are not the sinners. Who are His faithful here assembled? Titles and honors must be counted for nothing; you will be stripped of them before Jesus Christ. Who are they? Many sinners who have no wish for conversion; still more who hope for it, but at some future date; many others who repent but to fall again; and last a goodly number who imagine that they do not need conversion: behold the number of the castaways! Cast aside these sinners, then, from this holy gathering, for they will be cast aside on the awful day. Come forward now, O just! Where are you? O remnant of Israel, pass to His right hand! True wheat of Jesus Christ, scatter from you this straw which is destined for the fire! O God, where are Thy chosen? And who remains to form Thy heritage?

My brothers, our doom is almost certain, and we think upon it not![3]

Naturally, the passage loses a good deal of its force in translation. But, in attempting to analyze its emotional power, we can see that Massillon presented to his hearers both the greatest *good* and the greatest *evil* of all: salvation and eternal damnation. By means of an elaborate *mise-en-scene* he brought home to them the terrible intimacy with which their eternal destiny was *their own personal concern.* And all this in such *vivid and colorful language* that those present in the chapel at Versailles could almost feel themselves actually present at the final judgment of mankind. The author of the *Annales Littéraires,* writing of these words of Massillon, stresses substantially the same points: ". . . he had been speaking of the difficulties of salvation and of the small number of the elect, with a development of considerations and of proofs proportionate to the *importance of the subject.* All at once, *applying, by an admirable restriction, to his hearers alone* that which he had said of mankind in general, he cried: [here the author quotes in part the section from Massillon's sermon reproduced above]. As everyone knows, the hearers, frightened by these *awe-inspiring images,* rose to their feet in terror. It was one of the most spectacular triumphs of oratorical art."[4] In view of this comment, we do not feel that our explanation of the emotional effect of the sermon depends upon a desire to force it into the strait-jacket of a preconceived theory.

---

[3] *Oeuvres Complètes de Massillon, Évêque de Clermont,* Besançon, Chez Ant. Montarsolo et Cie., 1822, tome second, pp. 179–81 (translation ours).

B. *John Henry Newman's sermon on "The Second Spring"*

In July 1852 the first Provincial Synod of Westminister was held at St. Mary's College, Oscott. The synod was a symbol of the renewed life of the Catholic Church in England: the English Catholic hierarchy had been re-established and Catholic diocesan bishops ruled their flocks for the first time since the triumph of Protestantism three centuries before. Sermons were preached at the gathering by Cardinal Wiseman, Henry Edward Manning and John Henry Newman.

The sermon preached by Newman is one of the most perfect pieces of eloquence in English literature. Even today, it is almost impossible to read it without being deeply moved; and its emotional effect on those who first heard it was remarkable. According to an eye-witness of the scene (William Bernard Ullathorne, Archbishop of Birmingham), Cardinal Wiseman, who presided, and the bishops and clergy in attendance were nearly all in tears. After the sermon, Newman had to be rescued by Dr. Manning from the bishops and priests who crowded about him with heart-felt expressions of gratitude.[5]

It is difficult to convey a fair idea of the beauty of "The Second Spring" through extracts; every part depends, for its significance, on the whole. The plan of the sermon is very simple. It has but one main idea: "The English Church was, and the English Church was not, and the English Church is once again. This is the portent, worthy of a cry. It is the coming in of a Second Spring; it is a restoration in the moral world, such as that which yearly takes place in the physical."[6]

As a parallel to the revival of the Catholic Church in England, Newman recalled to his hearers the phenomena of nature,—the glory of the springtime and the summer, the chill death of winter, and the yearly miracle of resurrection in the new-coming of the spring:

> The sun sinks to rise again; the day is swallowed up in the gloom of the night, to be born out of it, as fresh as if it had never been quenched. Spring passes into summer, and through summer and autumn into winter, only the

---

[4] Jean Joseph Dussault, *op. cit.*, tome troisième, pp. 264–66 (translation ours).

[5] Cf. Dom Cuthbert Butler, *The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne*, London, Burns, Oates and Washbourne, Ltd., 1926, Vol. I, p. 197.

[6] John Henry, Cardinal Newman, *Sermons Preached on Various Occasions*, London, Longmans, Green, and Co., 1892, p. 169.

> more surely, by its own ultimate return, to triumph over that grave, towards which it resolutely hastened from its first hour. We mourn over the blossoms of May, because they are to wither; but we know, withal, that May is one day to have its revenge upon November, by the revolution of that solemn circle which never stops—which teaches us in our height of hope, ever to be sober, and in our depth of desolation, never to despair.[7]

Newman reminded his hearers of the former glories of the Catholic Church in England, with "the honours of near a thousand years upon it" and "enthroned on some twenty sees up and down the broad country." He told the story of the spoliation of the majesty of that presence: "Its temples were profaned or destroyed; its revenues seized by covetous nobles, or squandered upon the ministers of a new faith. The presence of Catholicism was at length simply removed,—its grace disowned,—its power despised,—its name, except as a matter of history, at length almost unknown."[8]

But there was a miracle in store for England. The Catholic Church was to rise and live once more. "Shall the past be rolled back? Shall the grave open? Shall the Saxons live again to God? Shall the shepherds, watching their poor flocks by night, be visited by a multitude of the heavenly army, and hear how their Lord has been new-born in their own city? Yes; for grace can, where nature cannot. The world grows old, but the Church is ever young. She can, in any time, at her Lord's will, 'inherit the Gentiles, and inhabit the desolate cities.' "[9]

Newman did not present his picture of the re-establishment of the Church in England as a phenomenon which his hearers were doomed to witness from the outside. They were part of it. Its building was, under God, entrusted to them; its tribulations were their sufferings; its glory was their pride. Newman stresses the intimate connection between his hearers, the bishops and priests of England, and the Second Spring of the Church:

> Yes, my Fathers and Brothers, and if it be God's blessed will, not Saints alone, not Doctors only, not Preachers only, shall be ours—but Martyrs, too, shall re-consecrate the soil to God. We know not what is before us, ere we win our own; we are engaged in a great, a joyful work, but in proportion to God's grace is the fury of His enemies. . . .
>
> Have we any right to take it strange, if, in this English land, the spring-

---

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 164.

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 169–70.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 176.

> time of the Church should turn out to be an English spring, an uncertain, anxious time of hope and fear, of joy and suffering,—of bright promise and budding hopes, yet withal, of keen blasts, and cold showers, and sudden storms?
>
> One thing alone I know,—that according to our need, so will be our strength. One thing I am sure of, that the more the enemy rages against us, so much the more will the Saints in Heaven plead for us; the more fearful are our trials from the world, the more present to us will be our Mother Mary, and our good Patrons and Angel Guardians; the more malicious are the devices of men against us, the louder cry of supplication will ascend from the bosom of the whole Church to God for us. We shall not be left orphans; we shall have within us the strength of the Paraclete, promised to the Church and to every member of it.[10]

Throughout the sermon shines the brilliant light of the glowing Newman rhetoric. The choice of words is perfect, without a single false or discordant note. The language is concrete and imaginative, appealing to the experience of the hearers. Witness, to take only a single example, Newman's description of the Catholics of England as they appeared to Protestant eyes only half a century before the re-establishment:

> . . . a mere handful of individuals, who might be counted, like the pebbles and *detritus* of the great deluge, and who, forsooth, merely happened to retain a creed which, in its day indeed, was the profession of a Church. Here a set of poor Irishmen, coming and going at harvest time, or a colony of them lodged in a miserable quarter of the vast metropolis. There, perhaps an elderly person, seen walking in the streets, grave and solitary, and strange, though noble in bearing, and said to be of good family, and a "Roman Catholic." An old-fashioned house of gloomy appearance, closed in with high walls, with an iron gate, and yews, and the report attaching to it that "Roman Catholics" lived there; but who they were, or what they did, or what was meant by calling them Roman Catholics, no one could tell;—though it had an unpleasant sound, and told of form and superstition.[11]

It is not remarkable that a sermon of this sort was profoundly touching to that distinguished congregation in St. Mary's at Oscott. Nor do we need any subtle and far-fetched analysis in order to understand why it appealed so strongly to their emotions. Newman has presented an emotional object,—the magnificent *good* of the re-establishment of the Church in England, after the sad state to which it had been reduced by its oppressors. He has shown his hearers *their own intimate connection* with this good; their right, not only as Catholics but as bishops and priests, to a holy pride; their privilege of gaining added glory for God and His Church by their labors and sufferings.

---

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 178, 179–80.

[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 171–72.

The whole discourse is *imaginatively* integrated by the inspired picture of the Second Spring, delineated even to the exquisite reference to the English spring, with whose beauties and vagaries his hearers were so familiar. The appeal to the imagination of this parallel is fortified by the *language* in which it is expressed,—language as precise and colorful as the illuminations in an ancient hymnal.

Thus we have, in Newman's "Second Spring," an outstanding exemplification of the concrete use of the principles we have outlined.

We do not, of course, maintain that either Massillon or Newman made *conscious*, *explicit* utilization of the principles set forth in this study. The fact remains that an examination of their sermons reveals them to have proceeded in a manner quite in accord with the theory of emotional appeal based on the Scholastic teaching regarding the nature of emotion. Before passing on to the next section, may we suggest that the reader would perhaps find it interesting to think back over those sermons by which he himself was deeply stirred, either in their hearing or reading, and to consider whether their authors had implicit recourse to the three principles which are the subject of these articles.

THE APPEAL TO THE EMOTIONS: ANCIENT AND MODERN THEORIES

Granting that the examples given above appear to be in conformity with the principles we have suggested, the question logically arises: could not the appeal to the emotions in preaching be explained equally as well, and perhaps better, by another theory, or even by several others?

We must not imagine that the value of a philosophical approach to the problem of the appeal to the emotions necessarily lies in the fact that it provides us with a set of practical principles of which no one has ever thought before. The function of philosophy, unless we are mistaken and have been deluded by a succession of unscrupulous professors, is to answer the question "why?" concerning the pronouncements of the common sense of man, and to organize into a comprehensible whole the isolated data of that common sense. We can expect, therefore, of a philosophical theory of the appeal to the emotions in preaching, that it give us the reason *why* of the success of a certain method of appeal, and, in so doing, allow us to construct a convenient formula for our own guidance in the practical exercise of that appeal.

Of the principles we have mentioned, the third (stressing the necessity of vivid, concrete, imaginative language) has, so far as we know, never been denied by any writer on the art of eloquence. While there is no such explicit agreement regarding the other two,—the necessity of presenting (1) a good to be gained or an evil to be avoided (2) personally and intimately affecting the hearers,—they have both, at one time or another, either together or separately, been advocated by a number of authors of treatises on public speaking.

Quintilian, for example, clearly (though implicitly) presupposed all three. For him, the prime essential for stirring the emotions in others was first of all to feel it oneself.[12] He advocated that the orator stir up emotion in himself by presenting the emotional situation in his *imagination* with such vividness that it would seem actually to be before his very eyes.[13] In the case of pity, for instance, he should really believe that the *ills* of which he complains *have befallen his own self*. He should identify himself with those who have suffered, and for a brief space feel their suffering as if it were his own.[14] In other words, the orator, wishing to arouse emotion in himself so that he may convey it to others, first finds the emotional *object* in the case (an "ill" or evil when pity is to be excited); he then conceives it as *personally affecting himself*, and impresses it upon himself by an *imaginative representation.*

It must be noted that Quintilian is applying this method of procedure to the speaker alone. The factor upon which he is insisting is the necessity of the orator himself first feeling the emotion. We cannot, then, call upon Quintilian as an explicit witness to the validity of the principles we have submitted for the arousing of emotion in the speaker's hearers; but we can certainly ask why the same factors which arouse emotion in the orator should not do the same for the listeners, who are men no less than he. As a matter of fact, the orator conceives his subject matter in this fashion so that he may present it in the same manner to his hearers, with the added feature of his own deeply moved presentation. (The question which Quintilian brings up, of the prime importance of feeling an emotion oneself before attempting to present it to others, we shall consider in the next issue of the *Review.*)

---

[12] Cf. Quintilian, *Instituto Oratoria*, with an English Translation by H. E. Butler, M.A., "The Loeb Classical Library," London: William Heineman; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, Vols. I and II, 1921, Vols. III and IV, 1922, Bk. VI, Chap. II, No. 26.

[13] Cf. *ibid.*, Bk. IV, Chap. II, Nos. 29–30.

[14] Cf. *ibid.*, Bk. VI, Chap. II, No. 34.

In the Ciceronian *locus classicus* concerning the appeal to the emotions, the greatest of the Roman orators is more explicit regarding the "good to be gained" and "personally affecting the hearers," than is Quintilian. Cicero advocates that we begin, first of all, by considering whether *the case calls for such treatment*, since an emotional presentation should not be given to petty matters. Then, using the emotion of love as an example, he observes that it may be aroused if the author is thought to be upholding the interests of the audience, or to be working for good men, or at any rate for such as the audience deems good and useful.[15] Which is to say that for stirring the feelings of men, there must be a basis in the speech itself; an emotional *object* on which to work. And in the example which Cicero uses to illustrate his point, we find him insisting that this object must be *good and useful in the estimation of the audience.* We might add that anyone who has read even a single oration of Cicero will not question his belief in the necessity of vivid, colorful terminology.

When we began these articles last month with a reference to the disagreement regarding the appeal to the emotions in public speaking, we had in mind particularly the modern treatises on the subject of oratory. Usually based on the experience of their authors in speaking or teaching, they contain a multitude of hints on how to express one's personality, or win friends and influence people, or impress the board of directors, etc., through the medium of public speaking. There is little integration of isolated recommendations, and the widest diversity regarding the nature of emotion.

We are dealing here with the appeal to the emotions in preaching alone, not in public speaking in general; and the third part of this study will consider emotional appeal in view of the peculiar problems connected with the sermon. The basic theory of such appeal, however, is as applicable, in its broader aspects, to any public discourse as it is to the sermon. Hence, while we have no intention of surveying the ideas expressed in a multitude of books concerning the art of eloquence, it will not be out of place to comment very briefly on a few of the more recent treatises which actually go to the trouble of presenting a philosophical theory of the emotions as the background for their practical suggestions.

---

[15] Cf. Cicero, *De Oratore*, with an English translation by E. W. Sutton, B.C.L., M.A., and H. Rackham, M.A., "The Loeb Classical Library," Two Volumes, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann, Ltd., 1942, Bk. II, Chaps. L–LI, Nos. 204–206.

It was perhaps natural that Walter Dill Scott, writing his *The Psychology of Public Speaking* in the early nineteen hundreds, should have been dominated by the then fashionable theories of Darwin and William James. His work is still popular and was reprinted in 1926. Professor Scott withholds his unqualified approval from the James-Lange theory of emotion, (which reverses the common sense interpretation that bodily changes *follow* the psychic perception of the exciting factor, and maintains that it is the bodily changes which are directly aroused, and that our feeling of these changes *is* the emotion: so that we do not cry because we feel sorry, but feel sorry because we cry). Nevertheless, he advocates this theory as especially valuable for public speakers.[16] We must admit that we fail to see how it has any value at all. Quite apart from the fact that the weight of argument and authority is definitely against the James-Lange theory, how does a theory that the bodily changes are the cause of the psychic state help us understand how to arouse emotion? At least, when we know that we are appealing to the sense appetite through the imagination, as is the case when we accept the Scholastic theory, we have something on which to work. We can appeal to the imagination readily enough; but how does one go about producing a bodily change as such in his hearers? The answer, we suppose, might be given that we present a "stimulus" to which the bodily change is an automatic "response", and the result an emotion. But what is to guide us in the production of this stimulus?

While Professor Scott is not enthusiastic for the James-Lange theory as a theory, in spite of his belief in its practical value, he accepts wholeheartedly the Darwinian evolutionary hypothesis, and draws up a set of principles for the expression of the emotions, based upon the theories of Darwin, Spencer and Wundt.[17] The scope of this paper does not permit a detailed criticism of Professor Scott's principles and their theoretical bases. Suffice it to say that they all deal with the *expression* of emotion; we are as far as ever from knowing *how to arouse emotion in our hearers*. It is quite possible for an audience to observe a speaker *portraying* an emotion, to agree that he is portraying it correctly, to recognize the emotion being portrayed, *and yet remain utterly unmoved*. The correct portrayal of emotion does enter into the delivery of an address, as an element in the total emotional object presented to the audience, but if it is to be helpful in conveying that emotion to the listeners, we believe that it must presuppose in the address itself the three principles suggested by the Scholastic theory.

---

[16] Cf. Walter Dill Scott, *The Psychology of Public Speaking*, Philadelphia, Pearson Brothers, 1907, p. 59.

[17] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 78–79, 90–91, 95.

The Psychology of Persuasive Speech, by Robert T. Oliver, is a work of considerable value. The author recognizes the connection of an emotional state with something personally affecting the experiencing subject. He also affirms the need of some sort of *cognition* in association with the emotion.[18] In his opinion, however, we are reduced to a simple "stimulus-response" mechanism in the explanation of human action.[19] It would be possible, we believe, to arrive at some sort of agreement between the principles of appeal to the emotions based on the Scholastic teaching, and the ideas contained in *The Psychology of Persuasive Speech*, but it would be rather a far-fetched concordance.

Of all the modern treatises on public speaking which we have had occasion to consult, *Public Speaking*, by Donald Hayworth, Ph.D., seems to us to be of the most practical value to the speaker in the matter of the appeal to the emotions. Dr. Hayworth recognizes the fact that man has an innate tendency toward what is good and away from what is evil for him, and that the emotions are in some manner bound up with this tendency. He recommends that the speaker deal with realities, and employ factors which can be made to appear vital to his hearers.[20] We must, however, question his theory that man is provided with emotions because emotions, releasing random activity and more than normal vigor, better enable him to survive and perpetuate his race.[21] Random activity may aid a monkey in finding out how to open the door of his cage; but a man has the power to *think* himself out of a difficult situation; random, that is, aimless and haphazard, activity may be a direct obstacle, rather than a help, in doing so. We need hardly mention, also, that *all* emotions do not release more than normal vigor; some, such as dread and shame, have an inhibiting or paralyzing effect.

In closing this section we may say that we find no difficulty in correlating the Scholastic idea of emotion with the directives concerning emotional appeal contained in the classic treatises of Quintilian and Cicero. Regarding the modern theories of emotion, we do not believe that a strictly, or even primarily physiological concept of the nature of emotion can be of much direct practical aid to the student of public speaking. Almost every treatise, of course, contains something of value; but we feel that the Scholastic theory of emotion, which stresses the psychic as well as the physiological element, is the safest guide for the speaker in general and for the preacher in particular.

---

[18] Cf. Robert T. Oliver, *The Psychology of Persuasive Speech*, New York, Longmans, Green and Co., 1942, pp. 164–65.

[19] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 15.

[20] Cf. Donald Hayworth, Ph.D., *Public Speaking*, New York, The Ronald Press Company, 1935, pp. 220, 222.

[21] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 224.

Next month, we shall conclude this series of articles on the appeal to the emotions in preaching by an application of the principles to the actual composition and delivery of the sermon, with a brief examination of some particular psychological problems which arise.

Washington, D. C. EDMOND DARVIL BENARD.

A LETTER FROM ST. JEROME

St. Jerome, one of the greatest scholars among the Fathers of the Church, is also the most vigorous and violent writer, Tertullian not excepted. But there is a great difference between Jerome and Tertullian. Whenever Tertullian becomes extreme, he borders on heresy and favors it. Jerome may seem to lose his temper but it is only in defense of the orthodox faith. Every heresy is a personal affront he feels keenly; every heretic is Jerome's declared enemy. His polemic and dogmatic works bear the imprint of his indignation; the titles of those works sound like a call to the attack: *Adversus Helvidium* . . . ; *Adversus Jovinianum; Contra Pelagianos; Contra Vigilantium;* etc. Jerome is always a champion of the faith, saving the essentials of Christian charity for his opponents, while giving full play to his indignation over their errors. His invectives are easily mistaken for a display of temper, when in fact they are nothing but righteous wrath and just anger.

A sacred indignation must not be confused with pure irritation; it is not a sin, not even an imperfection. It is not a thing one ought to be ashamed of. On the contrary, it is worthy of praise: "If one is angry in accordance with right reason, his anger is deserving of praise."[1] "For without anger, teaching will be useless, judgments unstable, crimes unchecked."[2] Anger is in accordance with right reason only when it follows the sound judgment of reason itself. Indignation may be called a zealous anger. According to St. Thomas indignation hinders somewhat the judgment of reason in the execution of the act, but it does not destroy the rectitude of reason itself. "The zealous anger," says St. Gregory, "troubles the eye of reason, whereas sinful anger blinds it."[3] Zealous anger is not incompatible with virtue and spiritual perfection. The Savior of mankind was meekness itself. On several occasions, however, He displayed a sacred indignation, a zealous anger: "Looking round about on them with anger, being grieved for the blindness of their hearts."[4] His indignation on account of the money-changers of the temple,[5] and the hypocritical scribes and

---

[1] St. Thomas, *Sum. Theol.*, II–II, q. 158, a. 1.

[2] Hom. XI in *Opus Imperfectum*, attributed to St. J. Chrysostom.

[3] *Moralium* V, 45.

[4] *Mark* 3:5.

[5] *Matt.* 21:12.

Pharisees[6] called forth words and actions that a superficial observer may construe as a display of temper. "Moses was a man exceeding meek above all men that dwelt upon the earth."[7] But the same Moses, the day his people fell into idolatry, gave expression to his indignation in a most violent form: "When he came nigh to the camp, and saw the calf, and the dances: and being angry, he threw the tables [of the law] out of his hand, and broke them at the foot of the mount."[8] He destroyed the calf and ordered the sons of Levi to kill every man his brother, friend and neighbour. Twenty three thousand men were killed by his command on that day.

It is evident that even a just anger will manifest itself according to the natural temperament of the person who displays it. A vigorous temperament will often express a just anger in a violent way. St. Jerome was of this type. He himself admits that his indignation could become immoderate at times: "I will frankly admit," he says, "that my indignation overpowers me; I cannot listen with patience to such sacrilegious opinions."[9]

His courage and sincerity are manifest from the fact that he prefers to assail his opponents directly and openly. The presbyter Riparius from south Gaul reported to Jerome that Vigilantius, a presbyter of a neighbouring parish, was spreading false doctrines, condemning the worship of the martyrs and their relics, the night vigils, virginity, etc. In an outburst of indignation, Jerome answered Riparius' letter condemning Vigilantius and requested Riparius to send him the book written by Vigilantius in order that he might attack it directly. This letter to Riparius was written the year 404. Two years later, Jerome received the desired work of Vigilantius through Sisinnius who came from Gaul bringing alms to the East.

Jerome read the book in which Vigilantius had dared to "pour forth a torrent of filthy venom upon the relics of the holy martyrs." The following night was spent in dictating the refutation of those errors. The result was the little treatise *Contra Vigilantium*. "I have devoted to the dictation of these remarks the labour of a single night."[10]

Any error against faith, any irreverence for religion, was a provocation for the holy Doctor. This was not the first time that he had been provoked by Vigilantius. In 395, Vigilantius on his return to Gaul after his visit to the holy Land, where he had enjoyed St. Jerome's hospitality, had openly accused him of favoring the heresy of Origen. Jerome wrote a letter to Vigilantius full of sorrow and indignation: "Your insult offered to myself I bear with patience: your impiety towards God I cannot bear." He concluded the letter with the wish that "Christ may give you grace to listen and to hold your peace, to understand and to speak accordingly."[11]

---

[6] *Matt.* 23:13–33.

[7] *Num.* 12:3.

[8] *Exod.* 32:19.

[9] *Letter 109 ad Riparium*, 3.

[10] *Contra Vigilantium*, 17.

Vigilantius did not listen,—nor did he hold his peace. He began to spread the same errors regarding the veneration of saints and relics, religious life, virginity, etc., which were later preached by the Protestants of the sixteenth century and were condemned by the Council of Trent.[12] We may well say that St. Jerome's violent reaction and indignant reply were instrumental in crushing and suppressing the budding heresy in southern France, where it was spreading with the approval and support of Exsuperius, bishop of Toulouse. It is to be regretted that another scholar of St. Jerome's caliber and temper was not at hand to express an equal indignation and condemnation at the outbreak of the Protestant heresies.

Vigilantius is too good a name; Jerome nicknames him *Dormitantius*, the Dozing one! Every nation on earth had produced monsters, except Gaul, until *Dormitantius* was born there. To Jerome, *Dormitantius* seems to be the reincarnation of the heretic Jovinian who "condemned by the authority of the Church of Rome, amidst pheasants and swine's flesh breathed out, or rather belched out, his spirit."[13]

Jerome knows that the father of Vigilantius was a tavern-keeper,—this explains the deceitfulness of the son! The father was experienced in cheating people by mixing water with wine; the son *Dormitantius* is clever in blending the perfidious poison of heresy with the Catholic faith. In the first chapter of his work, St. Jerome seems more inclined to amuse himself than to confute the heresy. However, he is only feigning amusement in order to veil his grief: "This I have poured forth with more grief than amusement, for I cannot restrain myself and turn a deaf ear to the wrongs inflicted on apostles and martyrs." In spite of this admission, he continues in the same vein: "Vigilantius is a barbarian both in speech and knowledge. His style is crude. He cannot defend even truth." "He certainly well represents his race.

---

[11] *Letter* 61.

[12] Cf. DB 984–988.

[13] *Contra Vigilantium*, 1.

Sprung from a set of brigands and persons collected from all quarters." (Historical evidence is offered by St. Jerome to prove this last statement.) "Vigilantius has lost his head and ought to be put in a straight jacket."[14]

St. Jerome reminds *Dormitantius* of the distinction between the adoration which we render to God alone and the veneration which we manifest for His servants: "Madman, who in the world ever adored the martyrs? who ever thought man was God."[15] From examples taken from the Old and the New Testament and from Church tradition he proves the lawfulness of the custom of honoring God's saints and their sacred relics, a practice often approved by God Himself by means of miracles.

Another Christian practice censured by Vigilantius was that of lighting tapers (our modern vigil-lights) in honor of the holy martyrs even in day-time when their light was obviously a waste. "All those who light these tapers", says St. Jerome, "have their reward according to their faith" . . . Once upon a time even the Apostles (Matt. 26:8) pleaded that the ointment was wasted, but they were rebuked by the voice of the Lord."[16] Here St. Jerome tells us about the old custom of lighting candles at the reading of the Gospel as a sign of joy: "Throughout the whole Eastern Church, even when there are no relics of the martrys; whenever the Gospel is to be read the candles are lighted, although the dawn may be reddening the sky, not of course to scatter the darkness, but in order to manifest our joy."[17]

Why be a monk? asked Vigilantius; why go to the desert? Jerome replies: "The reason is plain: That I may not hear or see you; that I may not be disturbed by your madness; that I may not be engaged in conflict with you."[18] Jerome realizes that he has not summoned together all the proofs at his disposal for the defense of the several Christian practices assailed by Vigilantius and he justifies himself by saying: "The subject itself was so openly blasphemous as to call for the indignation of a writer rather than a multitude of proofs."[19] However, he solemnly reminds his opponent of his reserve: "If *Dor-*

---

[14] *Ibid.*, 4.

[15] *Contra Vigilantium*, 5.

[16] *Ibid.*, 7.

[17] *Ibid.*, 7.

[18] *Ibid.*, 16.

[19] *Ibid.*, 17.

mitantius wakes up that he may again abuse me. . . . I will spend upon him something more than this short lucubration!"[20]

It seems rather obvious that St. Jerome was not a man to listen quietly to the impudent arrogance of heretics. But his righteous indignation had its source in purity of life, a living faith and the ardent zeal of a valiant warrior for Jesus Christ.

Washington, D. C. PASCAL P. PARENTE.

---

[20] *Ibid.*, 17.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT

The Peace of Crespy was signed September 18, 1544 by the Emperor Charles V and Francis I, King of France. It marked the end of the fourth war between these rulers, a war which had involved all Europe from England to Turkey. Because of that peace Pope Paul III was able to publish the Bull *Laetare Hierusalem*[1] on November 19, 1544. This document summoned the Council of Trent to convene on the fourth Sunday of Lent, March 15, 1545. The Council did not actually open until the following second Sunday of Advent, December 13, 1545.

Thus this year marks the four hundredth anniversary of the convocation and next year the four hundredth anniversary of the actual opening of the Council of Trent. These great events will be commemorated throughout the entire Catholic world, as far as war conditions will permit. We hope in this paper to give some idea of the historical background of this Council.

Paul III published a *Bulla Indictionis*, the *Initio nostri pontificatus*[2] on May 22, 1542, summoning a Council to meet in the city of Trent on November 1 of that year. The same obstacles which had beset him and his predecessors in their attempts to convoke the Council forced him to postpone the actual inauguration until three years later. Paul III thus describes his difficulties:

> For while we realized that peace was necessary to free and preserve the commonwealth from the many dangers that threatened it, we found all filled with hatreds and dissensions, and particularly those princes, to whom God has entrusted almost the entire direction of affairs, at enmity with one another.
>
> Whilst We deemed it necessary for the integrity of the Christian religion and for the confirmation within us of the hope of heavenly things, that there *be one fold and one shepherd* (John 10, 16) for the Lord's flock, the unity of the Christian name was well-nigh rent and torn asunder by schisms, dissensions and heresies. Whilst We desired the commonwealth

---

[1] Cf. Ehses, *Concilium Tridentinum* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1904), Vol. IV, pp. 385–88.

[2] Cf. Schroeder, *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, (St. Louis, 1941), pp. 1–10.

to be safe and protected against the arms and insidious designs of the infidels, yet, because of our transgressions and the guilt of us all, indeed, because of the wrath of God hanging over us by reason of our sins, Rhodes has been lost, Hungary ravaged, was war by land and sea intended and planned against Italy, and against Austria and Illyria, since the Turk, our godless and ruthless enemy, was never at rest and looked upon our mutual enmities and dissensions as his fitting opportunity to carry out his designs with success.[3]

It might be well to bear these words in mind when one is tempted to lament the delay in actually convoking and convening a General Council, the need of which everyone had fully realized. It may be true, what Pastor says of Paul III, i.e. "that he was not a man of the Catholic Reformation in the fullest sense of that expression";[4] yet on the other hand "during the whole of his pontificate he was the moving spirit in Catholic reform, and the pioneer of the Catholic restoration. Under him a strong Catholic movement gained step by step a sure foothold, and herein lay the practical value and the real significance of his reign. In the history of the papacy he marks the point of transition between an old age and a new."[5] That point of transition in his pontificate was the Council of Trent.

It has always been the assumed privilege and the tactic of heretics and those accused or suspected of heresy to appeal from the decision of higher ecclesiastical authorities to an Ecumenical Council. The whole fifteenth century was infected with the doctrine of the superiority of a General Council over the Pope. The unapproved decrees of the Council of Bâsle even proclaimed it. Later Gallicanism, Josephinism and Febronianism looked upon it as the primary tenet of their whole system of canonico-theological treatises until the Council of the Vatican finally proclaimed the primacy of the Roman Pontiff even over General Councils.[6]

In the controversies with Martin Luther, under Pope Leo X (1513–21) it was the heresiarch himself who first appealed to an Ecumenical Council to decide between his erroneous viewpoints on justification by Faith alone and the alleged complete corruption of human nature through original sin, as against the traditional doctrines of Mother Church concerning the necessity of good works and the possibility, through grace, of combating effectually the evil effects of concupiscence. But before appealing to a Council, Luther, in his letter to the Papal Legate Cajetan dated Oct. 18, 1518, intimated that "he would appeal from the badly informed Leo to a Pope who would be better informed" (*a male informato Leone ad Papam melius informandum*).[7] When he realized that nothing was to be achieved by this threat he appealed from any and all popes to a General Council—as though it would decide against the decisions of a Pope in his favor! But this he did in his famous "Appeal from the Pope to the Council," dated Nov. 25, 1518. It had this one effect, that by 1521 everyone present at the Diet of Worms, according to the Papal Legate Aleander, was clamoring for a Council. At the Diet of Nüremberg, February 5, 1523, the German Estates desired that the Pope, in agreement with the Emperor, convoke a "free Christian Council" at Strassbourg, Mainz, Cologne, Metz, or any other German town. By a "free Council" as is gathered from the explanation given by Luther in person, was meant not only one in which the Pope would have nothing to say, but also one directly called to approve the false doctrines of the superiority of the General Council over the Pope. Luther's strategy was evident. It was to get the German bishops and princes first to side with his errors and confirm them in common council; and then perhaps to force them on the Pope; and if not that, at least to vindicate himself before the German people and obtain free power to proselytize and inoculate all unwary and dissatisfied Germans with his doctrines.

---

[3] *Loc. cit.*

[4] *History of the Popes*, Vol. XI, St. Louis, 1923, p. 38.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 39–40.

[6] Sessio IV, July 18, 1870. (DB 1822–31.)

By thus trying to dispose of the Pope in such an important matter as a General Council Luther had by now arrived at the preposterous conclusion that the convocation of a General Council was a matter of the emperor and Christian estates alone. This was the thesis he maintained with his accustomed violence and insolence in his "Appeal to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation."

Luther argued that the time had now arrived when the control of the Catholic Church should be taken away from the Italians and the Roman Curia and be placed in the hands of the German princes—a sort of German-controlled Catholic Church. The idea was not entirely new; it was but the natural outgrowth of the ever-recurring *Nationis Germaniae gravamina* or complaints of the German nation against the Roman Curia. But the Diet of Nüremburg did not venture—openly at least—to accept the whole of Luther's thesis, fully realizing that a Council could be considered universal and ecumenical only on condition that the Pope, the representative of the unity and universality of the Church, gave it the support of his unqualified approval. And the young Catholic Emperor of Hapsburg felt the same way.

---

[7] Pastor, *op. cit.*, Vol. VII, p. 376.

Luther's ideas of what should be treated at the Council are included in the above-quoted address to the German nobility. They are nothing more than the expression of his deep-seated hatred for the Pope, the cardinals and bishops—and his conception of how they should be "reformed." He writes: "If they [i.e. the Pope, cardinals and bishops, etc.] do not do so [i.e. occupy themselves with the matters he suggests for their reform] the people at large and the temporal powers must do so, without considering the thunder of their excommunication."[8]

This was an open and defiant revolt against the authority of the Church and an attempt to wrest from the Pope the power of convoking, presiding over (in person or through his legate or delegate) and of confirming a General or Ecumenical Council, but Rome, which had weathered the Eastern and Western Schisms, was not unduly disturbed by the bellowing of an apostate friar and priest. To his insults and arrogance Leo X answered in a dignified manner by promulgating the famous Bull *Exsurge Domine* of June 15, 1520, in which he condemned 41 of the heretics' errors and incriminating statements.[9]

Leo X died shortly thereafter and was succeeded by Adrian VI (1522–23), the last non-Italian Pope. Adrian was not the man to shirk the difficulties involved in the convocation of a General Council to deal with Luther, and this in a manner far different from what the heretic had probably anticipated. Being a personal friend of the young Emperor—he had been his viceroy in Spain—Adrian would have found little remonstrance on the part of the German bishops and even princes in convoking just such a Council at that time. But unfortunately, the Pope died on Sept. 14, 1523, too soon to realize his ambitious projects of religious reform.

Clement VII (1523–34) inherited indeed his predecessor's earnest desire to heal the wounds of the Church, but he had neither his energy nor his clearness of vision for a matter of such grave importance. But his Legate, the famous Lorenzo Cardinal Campeggio, while combating at the Diet of Nüremburg, 1524, the fallacious proposals put forward by Luther's partisans for a German National Council, did agree to an Ecumenical Council in the real and strict eccelesiastical sense of the word. Nor did the Pope fail to support his Legate, although foreseeing, perhaps to an exaggerated degree, the difficulties that confronted him in so arduous a task.

---

[8] Luther, Translation in the Harvard Classics, Vol. XXXVI, p. 289.

[9] DB 741–81.

One difficulty was the grave political situation of Europe at the time. The rivalry between France and the House of Hapsburg, represented by those "gentlemanly enemies" Francis I and Charles V, had already produced two wars, both of them during the pontificate of Clement VII, and the end was nowhere in sight.

The second difficulty was that the danger of a further Turkish invasion into Eastern Europe was really imminent, as is evident from the Emperor's repeated appeals to the German princes for unity and action. Moreover the disloyal attitude of the German princes towards the Emperor, as also their subservience to Luther, made it clear that the Pope could not depend on any concerted co-operation in Germany. The same was true of Sweden, growing more powerful from day to day, whereas throughout Scandinavia serious defections to the "new Gospel" were continually occurring.

All of these reasons seemed like so many insurmountable obstacles to Clement VII, who was diffident and dilatory by nature. The "Sack of Rome" in 1527, which occurred under his very eyes as he was held a prisoner in Castel Sant' Angelo by the Spanish-German troops of Charles V was certainly no inspiration for the convocation or celebration of a General Council.

Clement remained indecisive towards the actual convoking of an Ecumenical Council, throughout his whole pontificate. Even Charles V's promise and threat to Clement VII in the "Treaty of Barcelona" (Jan. 6, 1530) to terminate the schism in Germany with the sword, was ineffectual. The Emperor appealed to the Pope for co-operation in an open warfare against the recalcitrants; "but", says Pastor, "after the letter had been received, Clement relapsed into his habitual indecision and pleaded various objections."[10]

The question of a General Council flared up repeatedly thereafter. In 1530 Campeggio took up the matter with Charles V anew; but the Pope assured both that a council would be of no avail. Nevertheless, on July 18, 1530, immediately after receiving a letter from the emperor, Clement did call together the twelve cardinals especially commissioned to handle German affairs to hear their viewpoints on the question of convoking a Council to deal with the religious and national

[10] Pastor, *op. cit.*, Vol. X, pp. 142–44.

affairs of Germany, which were growing more menacing from day to day. But here again no decision was reached since the twelve cardinals in question held that this was rather a matter for the whole consistory to consider and decide. The years 1530, 1531 and 1532 thus passed without any decision being taken. The Emperor placed the whole blame on King Francis I of France; not on the Pope.

When it had finally been learned that the city of Mantua would be available for such a meeting, the envoy of the Duke of Mantua wrote to his master under date of July 24, 1530: "A reformation is certainly necessary in view of the great corruption. God grant that it may not be brought about by the Turks instead of by the Council." The fact that many of the prelates themselves were not in favor of a council that would be at variance with their own manner of life—an echo of the Renaissance—seems likewise to have influenced Clement VII. "It is not surprising," says Pastor, "that such an assembly, bound to take into consideration the question of reform, should be displeasing to the many prelates of the worldly type. The latter took comfort in the supposition that the Protestants were not in earnest in their demands for a General Council."[11]

In the face of all these difficulties and obstacles, one need not be astonished to read these words taken from Heine: "Clement VII, partly from personal and partly from higher reasons, had such strong apprehensions that it seemed to him even less dangerous to tolerate the prolongation of the existing state of affairs in Germany than to summon a Council."[12]

During the years 1532–1533, however, negotiations and resolutions seemed headed towards a happy solution, when Francis I, answering the invitation of the Pope for co-operation, sent a short, cold response which dealt with matters along general lines, and gave no assurances about his wishes regarding representation at the proposed Council. Matters were still at a standstill when Clement VII died in 1534. It was left for his successor, Paul III (1534–49) to tackle the question of the Council fearlessly and bring it to a final actual convocation—if not a happy consummation.

Already as a Cardinal under Clement VII, the new Pope had been consistently friendly to the cause of the Council. In the very conclave which elected him Pope he expressed himself to this effect. From the beginning of his Pontificate he was bent on the furtherance of this important object. In the very first assembly of the cardinals after his election, on Oct. 17, 1534, he spoke of the necessity of summoning a Council.

---

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 138.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 137.

The greatest difficulty encountered by the new Pope was the question of selecting a place that would be agreeable to all concerned. Rome insisted that the council must be held in an Italian city. The Protestant rulers, meeting at Smalkald in December, 1535, rejected the proposal entirely. In this they were supported by Henry VIII of England (already lapsed into schism) and Francis I, who was always wary of Charles V and his relations to the Papacy, fearing lest an Italian city or one under imperial control would redound to the advantage of the Emperor. At the same time, however, Francis I was now willing to agree to the council and even sent assurances to that effect to Rome.

A visit of Charles V to Rome in 1536 led to a complete agreement between him and the Pope concerning the Council. Accordingly on June 2, 1536 Paul III published the Bull of Convocation, which had already been passed at the Consistory of May 29. In it he calls on all Patriarchs, Bishops and Abbots to convene in the city of Mantua on May 23, 1537 as had previously been agreed. Cardinal Legates were despatched with invitations to participate in the Council to the Emperor, Charles V; to the King of the Germans and Romans, Ferdinand I; to the King of France, Francis I, while a number of nuncios carried the message to all other Christian countries and to their rulers. Peter van der Vorst of the Netherlands, Bishop of Acqui, was sent to Germany to persuade the ruling princes to take part in the Council. But the Protestant rulers received the envoy most ungraciously; at Smalkald they curtly refused the invitation; in fact, according to Pastor, they even refused to open the papal briefs. Francis I took advantage of the war that had broken out anew between himself and Charles V in 1536, (the Third War between them) to declare the journey of the French bishops to the Council impossible.

Meanwhile however, despite all these apparent sources of discouragement, preparations for the Council were feverishly being made in Rome. The commission of reform, appointed in July, 1536, drew up a report as the basis for the correction of abuses in ecclesiastical life. The Pope himself began making preparations for the journey to Mantua in person. But the "powers of darkness" made a last attempt to thwart the work of the Holy Spirit of God. The Duke of Mantua (Spring of 1537) now raised objections towards holding the Council in his city—although he had formerly welcomed the Pope and the bishops to Mantua as a signal of favor and a sign of trust. He demanded for safety's sake that an armed guard be placed around the city. The Pope in his reply (April, 1537) considered this both unnecessary and harmful for peace of mind and the confidence of the Capitular prelates. In consequence of the disagreement, the Council was prorogued on April 20 to Nov. 1, the Pope hoping that in the meantime a new place agreeable to all concerned might be found. He consulted the Emperor and the King of the Germans. They suggested Trent; but, as was to be expected, this city met with the violent opposition of Francis I. Thereupon the Pope on August 29, 1537, addressed a Brief to the Venetians. The *Republica Serenissima* on Sept. 21 graciously consented to the use of the city of Vicenza as the seat of the Council.

To give the people of Vicenza time to make proper preparations, the Pope in the Consistory of Oct. 8, prolonged the prorogation to May 1, 1538, and announced these measures to the Christian princes in Briefs dated Oct. 18. The course of affairs was as usual obstructed by Francis I. Nevertheless, the three Legates who were to preside over the proceedings went to Vicenza. Only six bishops were present.

Paul III, believing that "to hold and celebrate the Council successfully with the help of God, it was a matter of prime importance, both for the celebration of the Council and for Christendom that the Christian princes be united in peace and concord",[13] invited both Charles V and Francis I, "the two chief props and supporters of the Christian name" to come together with him in conference at Nice. Although the Pope was not successful in obtaining a true and lasting peace between the rivals, he nevertheless was able to induce them to agree to a truce of ten years. Paul III now hoped that the Council could be convened at the appointed time and that even both the French King and the German Emperor would consent to come to Vicenza for the opening of the Council and bring with them the bishops of their respective countries.

On both of these points, however, the princes disagreed, asserting that as for themselves they must first return to their respective lands; and as for the prelates, that those who had accompanied them to Nice "being wearied and exhausted by the journey and its expenses must (first) recover and recruit themselves". While the Pope was rather unwilling to accede to these excuses, letters began arriving from the Legates already in Vicenza that hardly any foreign bishops had arrived. The Pope thereupon prorogued the opening of the Council to the following Easter, 1539.

---

[13] Cf. Schroeder, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

But now he was confronted with new difficulties, this time from King Ferdinand and the Emperor, who in the meantime had had another friendly visit with Francis I and desired first to meet with the German princes. The Emperor thus begged the Pope once more to prorogue the Council.

Somewhat discouraged perhaps, but not defeated, Paul III now not only prorogued the Council, but even suspended it in virtue of his action taken at the Consistory of May 21, 1539 and made an announcement to that effect in Apostolic Letters under date of June 10, 1539. The Pope then looked for more favorable circumstances to re-convoke the Council. But the affairs of Christendom instead of becoming better were daily becoming worse. On the death of their king, the Hungarians called on the Turks for aid and mercy; King Ferdinand thereupon declared war upon them. In the midst of this confusion Belgium revolted against the Emperor. Seeing that peace was not in the offing, the Pope decided to return to his former remedy of a General Council.

The question was again broached when the Pope met the Emperor at Lucca in 1541. Charles agreed that the Council should again be convoked for Vicenza; but now, the Venetians, pressed by war with the Turks, would no longer concede the use of that city. Whereupon the Emperor proposed Trent; Cardinal Contarini, Mantua. For the time being nothing was done. Instead, the Emperor and the King of France were invited to send the cardinals of their countries to Rome for a full discussion of the matters pertaining to the Council with the other cardinals of the Roman curia. Finally the Pope decided to assemble the Council and on May 22, 1542, after further consultation at Rome, convoked the Council to meet at Trent on Nov. 1, 1542.

Due to the conduct of Francis I and of the Emperor, the Pope was again prevented from opening the Council at the appointed time. Only a few Italian and German bishops had appeared at Trent.

Finally, after the above-named Peace of Crespy, Sept. 17, 1544, a reconciliation was effected between Paul III and Charles V. Francis I likewise abandoned his opposition and declared himself in favor of Trent as the place of the meeting. On Nov. 19, 1544 the Bull *Laetare Hierusalem* was issued by which the Council was again convoked to meet at Trent on March 15, 1545. In February of 1545 Cardinals Giovanni del Monte, Marcello Cervini, and Reginald Pole were appointed as papal Legates to preside at the Council. Since by March only a few bishops had come to Trent, the date of the opening again had to be deferred. But now the Emperor desired speedy action. Accordingly Dec. 13, 1545 was definitely set as the date for the first formal session. This was actually held in the choir of the cathedral of Trent after the first president of the Council, Cardinal del Monte, had celebrated the Mass of the Holy Ghost. The Council was then declared formally opened. The Bull of Convocation was read and the Bull appointing the conciliary legates published. January 7, 1546 was set as the date of the Second Session. Besides the three presiding Legates there were present: Cardinal Madruzzo, Bishop of Trent, four archbishops, twenty-one bishops, five generals of religious orders. In addition, the Council was attended by the legates of the King of Germany, Ferdinand, and by forty-two theologians, and nine canonists, who had been summoned as consultors. At the opening session the Cardinal Legate in his question, placed before the conciliar Fathers, gave six reasons for the convocation of the Council. His query was "Does it please you (1) for the praise and glory of the holy and undivided Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, (2) for the advance and exaltation of the Christian faith and religion, (3) for the extirpation of heresies, (4) for the peace and unity of the Church, (5) for the reform of the clergy and Christian people, (6) for the suppression and destruction of the enemies of the Christian name, to decree and declare that the holy and general Council of Trent begins and has begun?" They answered: "*Placet*, It pleases us"—and the XIX Ecumenical Council of Trent, which was to be a great turning point in the history of the Catholic Church and reap inestimable fruits even down to our day, despite all the machinations to impede it, had actually begun.

Washington, D.C. RAPHAEL M. HUBER, O.F.M. CONV.

THE NATURE OF GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE

In the minds of many the Gothic style of architecture is immediately recognizable by the pointed arch which for the sake of the uninitiated we may compare to two segments of a rim leaning against one another. This, however, is by no means the distinguishing feature of the Gothic art. The fact is that the pointed arch antedates the Gothic. It had long been in vogue in the Orient and occurred repeatedly in French Romanesque buildings. Gothic architecture is no more than the Roman grown to maturity. It is its logical and final development. It is the solution to a problem that faced all ancient craftsmen, Greek, Roman and Byzantine.

The dream of the ancients was to span a wall with stone. They hoped someday to find the secret of vaulting. The first Roman structures were covered with wood, set up on a series of triangles which in turn were bisected by uprights. This made a sturdy covering and provided an effective water shed. But the architects were far from satisfied with this hybrid construction. Wood too was always hazardous in times when efficient fire-fighting equipment was unknown. The method of stone roofing had to be found.

It did not require a great deal of imagination to visualize the so-called "barrel-vault." This was the simplest way of spanning walls with stone. However, it had this disadvantage; it could not be otherwise than massive. A simple stone arch exerts great lateral thrusts. Thus in the early attempts at vaulting, the walls were perforce of massive construction since their inertia had to counteract the lateral strains. There was therefore little possibility of that commonplace convenience known as the window. The most the Romanesque structure would permit was an occasional aperture through which a narrow beam of light was admitted to illumine the dark interior. Stained-glass and tracery windows had to await the coming of the Gothic.

The eastern craftsmen met the problem in another way. They constructed a cylinder in stone and then put a cover on it much the same as one puts a cover on a kitchen vessel. It became nothing more than an elevated igloo in stone. Here all the forces were perpendicular. There were no lateral thrusts. The walls were pushing heavenward and the dome was pushing earthward. It was a perfect equation. The only objectionable feature of the Byzantine was its essential rotundity. It took considerable ingenuity to adapt it to a rectangular structure.

If a rectangular structure was required—and this was the only desirable form for a church—a series of cupolas had to be set up. The multiple domes and minarets became the distinguishing feature of the Byzantine.

The Orientals reduced the cylindrical structure to the rectangle by the use of the so-called "pendentives." This process can perhaps be understood by taking a hollow wooden hemisphere and cutting away four equal segments so that the four remaining tips will touch the corners of a square. Just above the four resulting arches, cut away the top of the hemisphere. By this time you should have a rim resting on four arches. It is now a simple matter to rest a cylindrical drum on the rim and the entire structure will stand on four columns. This is what the Byzantine architects did in stone.

The Byzantine was certainly an ingenious solution and gave the world some magnificent buildings but it failed to reach the aspirations of craftsmen. When the final solution to the problem of vaulting was discovered, Gothic architecture was born.

The Gothic architects solved the problem by the application of two principles not unknown to their predecessors. The first was the concentration of strains and the second was the transmission of thrusts. Thus in the Gothic structure we find the groined vault replacing the barrel type and the flying buttress catching the lateral thrust and relaying it to the ground. The concentration of strains was accomplished by linking four columns with arches. The first set of arches leaped from column to column enclosing a rectangular area. The second set cut the rectangle diametrically and intersected each other. The summits of the arches were then joined by stone beams which necessarily were cruciform. The skeleton was then filled in with stone bringing the strains to four points. This superstructure was capable of standing on four columns. Each unit of a Gothic building is a rectangular quadruped. This is of the very essence of Gothic architecture.

As mentioned, in the Roman building the lateral thrusts were resisted by the inertia of the walls. In the Gothic, these thrusts (considerably less violent) were resisted by counter-thrusts and the resultant strain was caught up by the flying buttress. This is only saying that one unit leaned against the other until reaching the extremity of the building where architectural crutches were resorted to.

Since the groined vault practically neutralized lateral thrusts, walls were no longer essential to the structure. They had no structural work to do. The only function they now performed was to protect the worshippers from the elements. With the structural function of the wall gone, a new form of art came into being, that of the stained-glass window. At first small, the craftmen grew more daring with the passage of time until the windows of the Gothic cathedral became of giant proportions. This in turn begot the art of tracery which has to do with those ornamental ramifications found in Gothic windows. The introduction of rich colors was inevitable. The pointed arch, the stained windows with their tracery and the flying buttress are all incidental to the Gothic but inseparable from it as we know it today.

To anyone who gives the matter consideration it would seem that one thing any element of an artistic structure should do is express its function. This is only saying that it should tell the observer what work it is doing. When a pillar reaches up like the arm of Atlas it is telling you that upon it rests the weight of the superstructure. If on the contrary the vault is resting upon steel girders and held together with reinforced concrete and the pillar is consequently no more than an ornament, one of the first canons of art is being violated. Truth is being betrayed. The pillar is a lie wrought in stone. It is claiming to do a thing it does not do.

Many of our modern churches make pretense to Gothic art. In reality they are neither Gothic nor artistic. They are supercharged with elements that belie their function. A truly Gothic structure shows the function of every element and every element is doing exactly what it appears to be doing. In no other style of architecture do we find this same eloquence. Gothic art has both truth and beauty and has lived to see an epithet of savagery and contempt transformed to a synonym of the sublime.

Springfield, Mass. TIMOTHY J. CHAMPOUX.

SPIRITUAL READING AND THE PRIEST

In his little work *De Custodia Virginitatis,* written in the form of a letter to St. Eustochium in 384, St. Jerome relates that while he lay ill with a fever in Syria, he had a dream in which he was caught up in spirit and hailed before the judgment seat of God. A voice asked him who he was, and he replied that he was a Christian. "Thou liest," answered He that sat upon the throne. "Thou art a Ciceronian, not a Christian; for where thy treasure is, there shall thy heart be also." St. Jerome realized that he was receiving a divine rebuke because of his excessive fondness for the classics, especially Tully and Plautus, and because he had not altogether given up the library he had so carefully collected at Rome. He beheld the danger to his soul in the worldliness and paganism that lurked behind the beauty and seductive charm of Cicero's style. He repented and made a vow never again to read a secular book.

In our day a like danger exists for all those who would lead the supernatural life. But this danger does not arise from the attractions of humanism. It derives, rather, from the downward drag and undertow of the veritable deluge of publications of every conceivable variety that flood the country. By far more writing and more reading are done to-day than ever before in the world's history. About eight thousand books and nineteen thousand periodicals, ranging from the daily newspaper to the learned quarterly, are published in the United States annually.

Most of what is published is trivial or inconsequential, or even purely ephemeral; but a great deal of what appears in print is directly or indirectly harmful. Mr. Compton Mackenzie in a recent article in the London Daily Mail expressed the opinion that the evil preeminence so long maintained by France in the production of pornography and erotic fiction is now held by the United States. "The dirtiest novels of all," he says, "come from a country where prudery lingered in its sickliest form." If there is a lack of the classic beauty that tempted St. Jerome, there is certainly no lack of worldliness and paganism that threatened him.

The obvious antidote to what is dangerous in contemporary literature is the reading of religious books. And where books and periodicals imbued with the spirit of neo-paganism are so abundant and so much reading is done, books that edify become all the more important.

But spiritual reading is necessary not so much for the negative reason that it counteracts the solvent of secularism and the corroding influence of naturalism in current literature, as for the positive reason that it is one of the chief sources of edification. Spiritual reading affords edification because it is so closely connected with actual grace, because it disposes the soul for mental prayer, and because it helps to sustain, exercise, and develop the supernatural life.

Spiritual reading is an exterior grace, because it affects the subject exteriorly, like hearing a sermon or seeing a good example. Although spiritual reading is only an exterior grace, it has a twofold distinction. It is practically always a very important occasion of interior actual grace, and it bears a very close analogy to actual grace, which is an enlightenment of the intellect and a movement of the will. This likeness to actual grace is unquestionably the reason why spiritual reading is so often the occasion of interior grace.

In ordinary reading the intellect acquires knowledge and the will receives an inclination in view of this knowledge. In spiritual reading it easily happens that merely natural information becomes a supernatural illumination of the intellect and the natural inclination of the will becomes a supernatural inspiration; and what began as the merely natural act of reading ends in the soul's being enlightened and moved by supernatural actual grace. It is extremely difficult to determine where the natural leaves off and the supernatural begins, just where the merely natural enlightenment of the intellect and influence upon the will are superseded by divine grace, since one and the same act, reading, is the occasion of both the natural and the supernatural influences. But that such a distinction must be made is evident from the fact that the same passage, say of Sacred Scripture, can on one occasion be read with a merely natural result and on another with a supernatural enlightenment.

In his Confessions, St. Augustine describes the supernatural light that shone upon his intellect and brought about his conversion while reading a passage from St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. It can hardly be supposed that St. Augustine was reading those words for the first time. But when he had read them previously, they had informed his mind only in a natural way, and he had to wait until the hour of grace struck to behold their dazzling truth and receive their supernatural enlightenment.

A somewhat similar light flashed upon the mind of another great convert, Cardinal Newman, from reading a single sentence of St.

Augustine's. In 1839 he had been studying the Eutychians and Monophysites of the fifth century, and he had been having difficulty in understanding how they could be heretics unless Protestants and Anglicans were heretics also. He had just finished his course of reading when a friend put a copy of the Dublin Review for August, 1839, in his hands and drew his attention to an article in the "Anglican Claim to Apostolic Succession" by Dr. Wiseman, who compared the Anglicans to the Donatists. Newman read the article and was not impressed, because he saw that the two cases were not parallel. But his friend pointed to a sentence from St. Augustine, *Securus judicat orbis terrarum*, which Wiseman had quoted, and kept repeating it to Newman. The future Cardinal saw that these words made a position outside the Catholic Church undesirable.

It is not maintained, of course, that the mere reading of a text from St. Paul converted St. Augustine or that one sentence of the great African doctor converted Newman, who did not actually enter the Church until October 1845, about six years after he was so struck by the force of St. Augustine's words. But the two cases are cited as illustrations of how reading may be the occasion of a great actual grace of supernatural enlightenment that plays an important part in the complex process of conversion.

The action of grace upon the soul is often more prominent in one faculty than in the other. In the cases of St. Augustine and Cardinal Newman, the grace occasioned by their reading seems principally to have affected the intellect. But sometimes the force of actual grace is apparent rather in the movement given to the will. The conversion of St. Ignatius of Loyola to a life of perfection seems to be a case in point. He had been wounded in both legs in the defence of the citadel of Pampeluna against the French on 20 May, 1521. During the long weeks of his convalescence at the castle of Loyola, he sought to while away the time with reading, and he called for some chivalrous romances, his favorite kind of books. None was available, and he was given the lives of Christ and some of the saints instead. He fell to reading them in the same spirit in which he had been in the habit of reading the lives and feats of knights and men-at-arms. "Suppose," said he, "I were to rival this saint in fasting, that one in endurance, that other in pilgrimages." This was the beginning of the change which took place in his will and resulted finally in his becoming a great saint.

Nourishing the intellect with religious thoughts and stimulating the will to pious affections, as it does, spiritual reading leads to mental prayer. Proximately, or at least remotely, it is the indispensable preparation for mental prayer, especially for those who are only beginning the practice of that exercise, and it affords valuable help at all stages of the spiritual life. One of the most widely used methods of mental prayer is that of St. Ignatius known as the Method of the Three Faculties. This method corresponds to the natural need that ordinarily exists of using the three faculties of memory, intellect and will in mental prayer. It is spiritual reading that, according to the axiomatic principle *Nihil est in intellectu nisi prius in sensu*, provides the images and thoughts to be recalled by the memory and considered by the intellect in preparation for the most important part of mental prayer, the affections and resolutions of the will.

St. Benedict in his Holy Rule gives as the fifty-sixth instrument of good works "To listen willingly to holy reading." And the very next instrument, the fifty-seventh, is "To apply oneself often to prayer." He does not speak of meditation in the modern sense; he formulates no method comparable to the meditation methods that have come into use since the sixteenth century; he fixes no time for mental prayer. On the other hand, he prescribes from two to five hours of devout reading (*lectio divina*) a day. He knew that mental prayer follows easily and naturally upon devout reading. Much of the time assigned by him for spiritual reading was intended to be spent in mental prayer, so that mental prayer was not to last for a half-hour or an hour but more or less continuously throughout the day. It was to be the soul of the *Opus Dei*, for which he provides so carefully, and it was to accompany spiritual reading for which he makes so generous an allotment of time. Reading passes into mental prayer, and mental prayer tends to become contemplation and union with God.

St. Alphonsus in his treatise *De Oratione Meditationis* says that one may habitually practice other pious exercises and still, unfortunately, continue to live in the state of mortal sin, but that the habitual practice of mental prayer will not permit one long to remain in such a state. Either mental prayer or mortal sin will be given up. The confessor should exhort the devout soul, above all, "*ad faciendam orationem mentalem, scilicet ad meditationem veritatum aeternarum . . . Non possunt cohabitare oratio* (*mentalis*) *et peccatum. Anima aut relinquet orationem aut peccatum.*" Bishop John Cuthbert Hedley makes the same claim for the habitual practice of spiritual reading. He says: "Mortal sin cannot exist with the practice of Spiritual Reading. He who reads regularly comes to regard the slightest sin with horror, and the lightest occasion of sin with apprehension." Of course both are right. Spiritual reading leads to mental prayer, and the two go together.

Spiritual reading enriches the supernatural life, or man's participation in the life of God. The life of God consists in knowing and loving. Man, by nature, is in the image and likeness of God in so far as he has intellect and free will, and he imitates the life of God in the natural order to the extent to which he thinks and loves. Man elevated to the state of sanctifying grace, and thinking and loving under the influence of actual graces, imitates the life of God in the supernatural order far more perfectly, so perfectly, in fact, that he is said by St. Peter to be a "partaker of the divine nature." Since spiritual reading, so to speak, invites actual graces and is the occasion of supernatural enlightenment and inspiration, it may truly be said to nourish, stimulate, strengthen, and develop the supernatural life. It is like a garden in which Christ, the Divine Gardener, waters with the dew of grace, enlightens with the sunshine of His divine wisdom, quickens with the warmth of His love, and gives the increase to the supernatural life.

Spiritual reading is an exercise of the supernatural life. As prayer is "life in its highest form of expression, the exercise of intellect and will in elevating the soul to God," so too, for the same reason, although in a lesser degree, "reading is a kind of living." Reading, praying, living —this is the line of development, and there is a compenetration between the three processes. The more the supernatural life is exercised, the stronger and more abundant it becomes. All the Doctors of the Church are examples of this development of reading into living. They read the Sacred Scriptures; they meditated upon them; they lived them.

The inspirational power and effectiveness of spiritual reading depend largely upon getting the right book at the right time. What precisely is the right book, subjectively, at a given time, no one can say—unless possibly one's spiritual director. People differ greatly in their needs and in their susceptibilities to the influence of different types of reading, and it is well that there is such a vast variety of spiritual books from which to choose. People of imagination can always read the lives of the saints with relish and benefit, and find interest as well as profit in the countless stories and illustrations in those two classic works, *Practice of Perfection and Christian Virtues* by Alphonsus Rodriguez, S.J., and *Guide to the Spiritual Life* by John Baptist Scaramelli, S.J. Others will like better the books of writers like the Abbot Marmion. Not only do individuals differ from one another, but the same person has different needs and tastes as he matures, develops, and passes from one period of life to the next. Thus we grow up to books and away from them.

The late Dom John Chapman laid it down as a first principle that one should read only what appeals to one. Dom Roger Hudleston has traced from the letters of Dom Chapman the changes his tastes underwent. While still an Anglican, he depended mostly on the *Imitation of Christ*, which he called "that most wonderful of all human books." Shortly after his ordination to the priesthood Dom Chapman expressed a great liking for *On the Love of God* by Francis de Sales, the *Spiritual Combat* by Scupoli, and the section on *L'Abandon* in Monsignor Gay's *Les Vertus Chrétiennes.* As he grew older he developed an appreciation for the writings of St. Teresa, and later on for those of St. John of the Cross. During the last ten years of his life he derived most edification from the books of Pére de Caussade, S.J., especially from his letters. During this last period of his life he was also very fond of the writings of Blosius and of the Jesuit Pére Grou, "whose *Maximes Spirituelles* was the only book besides his Breviary which he took with him to the nursing home where he died."

Although individual differences make it impossible to draw up a list of spiritual reading books which could be said to be subjectively the best, it is easy to name a few works which stand out as objectively the best. The first place must be given to Sacred Scripture, especially to the Gospels and Epistles in the New Testament and to the Psalter, the sapiential and prophetical books in the Old. To the reading of Sacred Scripture is directly ascribed the conversion of a number of the Fathers of the early Church, notably St. Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, and St. Hilary.

As spiritual reading, Sacred Scripture, because of its divine authorship, is in a class by itself, and no other work can be compared with it. The Bible is not a book but a library of seventy-three books which have God for their author. St. Gregory the Great expresses a rather original view of Sacred Scripture. Writing to a physician named Theodore at Constantinople he chides him for his neglect of the Sacred Books. "What are the Holy Scriptures," he asks, "but so many letters from Almighty God to His poor creatures? . . . The Lord of Heaven, the King of men and of angels, in furtherance of your salvation, has written letters to you. And you neglect earnestly to read them." St. Augustine and St. John Chrysostom likewise speak of the Bible as consisting of letters from God to man.

The place of honor next after Sacred Scripture must be accorded to the writings of the Fathers of the Church. Christian tradition, in large measure, is enshrined in their works. But here rises the perplexing question which Fathers to read. In so vast a library of precious books, it is difficult to decide which to choose. Bishop Hedley recommends as most stimulating and satisfying the writings of St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, and St. Bernard.

Probably the most valuable and edifying book after the Sacred Scriptures and the works of the Fathers is the *Imitation of Christ*. It contains enlightenment and inspiration for every condition of life and every state of mind. It is an unfailing source of consolation and encouragement. The author, toward the end of his life, wrote, "I have sought for rest everywhere, but I have not found it, except in a little corner, with a little book." He was not, of course, speaking of his own work, but others who have sought in vain elsewhere may well find peace and comfort in that wonderful little book, the *Imitation of Christ*.

After naming the Sacred Scriptures, the writings of the Fathers, and the *Imitation of Christ*, it does not seem advisable to proceed further with a list of spiritual reading books for which a claim might be made that they are objectively the best. Tanquerey in *The Spiritual Life* gives a valuable list, which includes the more important ascetical works from the Patristic age to our own day. And P. Pourrat's *Christian Spirituality* affords a complete survey of the field of ascetical literature.

In this connexion it is worth noting that every religious order has, or in time produces, classic works which breathe the spirit of the order and best express its genius, principles, and peculiar teachings. It is most appropriate that the members of an order have a special regard for such works.

The disposition of the recipient of actual grace is of the utmost importance for its efficacy and fruitfulness. And since spiritual reading is so frequently the occasion of grace and so closely connected with it, the disposition and attitude one has toward spiritual reading are likewise of paramount importance. There must be a realization of the need of habitual and regular spiritual reading. Every priest has such a need. Spiritual knowledge acquired in the past must be kept alive and growing by continued and frequent reading if it is to be vigorous and productive.

Atchison, Kansas BONAVENTURE SCHWINN, O.S.B.

AN ACCUSATION AGAINST SCHOOL THEOLOGY

The recent Encyclical *Mystici Corporis* has naturally aroused a great deal of interest in the teaching about Christ's Mystical Body. One curious by-product of that interest has been the frequently repeated assertion that the school theology since the Middle Ages has in some way neglected to consider the Church as the Body of Jesus Christ. That is a serious charge. It deserves attention.

The implication seems to be that the writers of theological works used in seminaries and universities since the Middle Ages have failed to bring out the truths presented in the dogmatic portion of the *Mystici Corporis*. If the accusation has any legitimate foundation then the Encyclical should contain a teaching utterly alien to the literature of school theology from the middle of the fifteenth century until at least the beginning of the twentieth. The analysis of the *Mystici Corporis* text will show whether the charge is justified or not.

The dogmatic section of the *Mystici Corporis* is divided into two parts.[1] In the first part the Holy Father describes the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ. In the second he tells about the union of the faithful with our Lord.

Pope Pius XII begins his first section by telling why the Catholic Church is aptly described as a *body*. He informs us that the Church is thus described because it is visible and organized, possessing a visible rite of initiation, visible sacramental worship and visible members. It is called the body of *Christ* because our Lord is at once its founder, its head and its support. The term *Mystical* Body of Christ is applied to the Church since it is distinct from our Lord's physical body and at the same time superior to an ordinary society or moral body in that it has a principle of unity absolutely independent of and superior to the members.

In the second section of the dogmatic part, the *Mystici Corporis* speaks of the two types of bonds or communications by which men are joined to Christ within the Church. Those men who are united to our Lord by professing His faith, being subject to the legitimate spiritual rulers He has set over His sheepfold, and partaking in the Eucharistic worship which He instituted, are said to be joined in bodily and visible communication with Christ. The second type of communication is spiritual and invisible. It consists in the three theological virtues of faith, hope and charity. Our union with Christ is perfected by God the Holy Ghost dwelling within us. It is expressed in the Eucharistic sacrifice, which is pre-eminently the Act of the Mystical Body.

---

[1] Cf. the excellent outline appended to Father Joseph Bluett's edition of the *Mystici Corporis* (New York, The America Press, 1943), pp. 54–57.

In the light of the actual text of the *Mystici Corporis* the charge made against the school theology would seem to be groundless. The various elements which are brought together in the Encyclical's dogmatic section have all been considered in the standard literature of sacred theology since the Middle Ages. Moreover, several of the theses used by the Holy Father have been developed in the school theology since the controversies against the early Protestants.

There is certainly no ground for saying that the thesis on the visibility of the Catholic Church has been neglected since the Middle Ages. These conclusions received their scientific development at the hands of the Controversialists. Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius (1579) felt called upon to refute the objections of Brentius by proving that our Lord Himself, and not Peter Soto (1563), was ultimately responsible for this thesis.[2]

Although earlier theologians commonly taught that our Lord was the Founder of the Church, this portion of theology did not begin to have anything like its present theological development until around the end of the seventeenth century. The post-mediaeval school theologians dealt with our Lord's function as the head and the support of the Mystical Body, not only in the treatise *De Ecclesia Christi* but also in various parts of the section *De Verbo Incarnato*. The concept of the Church as the *Mystical* Body was never absent from the school theology. It is found quite well developed in the *Summa de Ecclesia* of the Cardinal John de Turrecremata (1468), one of the first great theologians after the Middle Ages. It was the turning point of the most important controversies in ecclesiology from his time to our own.

The teaching on the double bond of union with Christ within the Catholic Church was developed by Catholic controversialists and school theologians from John Driedo (1535) and James Latomus (1546) to St. Robert Bellarmine (1621). The doctrine on the indwelling of the Holy Ghost was found in treatises *De Missionibus Divinis*. The various tracts *De Eucharistia*, *De Sacrificio* and *De Sacerdotio* brought out the truth that the Mass is the Act of the Mystical Body.

---

[2] Cf. *Confutatio Prolegomenon Brentii*, Lib. III. In the *Opera Omnia*, Cologne, 1584, Vol. I, p. 535; also *op. cit.*, Lib. II, p. 494.

There is not one dogmatic element in the *Mystici Corporis* neglected or overlooked in the standard literature of school theology since the Middle Ages. Obviously not every author taught every point. Again, there were various individual writers and teachers who presented elements of the Mystical Body doctrine imperfectly and incompletely. The charge however is levelled at school theology as such, and that charge cannot be sustained.

Still, it is one thing to say that the older school theologians did not neglect the theology of the Mystical Body and quite another to deny that the *Mystici Corporis* and the various competent theological treatises on this same subject in our own time represent a definite progress in theological science. Modern theologians such as Mura, Tromp and Gruden have advanced the work of sacred theology considerably by writing their treatises on the Mystical Body. They have performed a work which previous theologians had left undone, not because the older writers failed to consider the teaching, but simply and solely because the science was not far enough advanced in previous times for the sort of work these recent theologians have accomplished.

What Pope Pius has done, and what the modern school theologians of the Mystical Body have done, is to bring together from every part of theology the various theses which will help men to appreciate the ineffable truth of the Catholic Church's union with our Lord. In doing this they acted in accordance with the principle laid down by the Constitution *Dei Filius* of the Vatican Council, which taught that men might obtain from God a certain understanding,—and a most fruitful understanding,—of the divine mysteries through the use of analogy with things known naturally and by a comparison of the mysteries among themselves and with the last end of man.[3] The twentieth century theologians of the Mystical Body have simply arrived at a more perfect presentation of their doctrine by bringing together elements which are explained in many parts of sacred doctrine.

The writers of school theology from the fifteen century to the nineteenth are not guilty of neglecting the teaching on the Mystical Body simply because this section of sacred doctrine has been developed in our own times. They knew and explained the theology of the Mystical Body even though they did not write the complete twentieth century type of treatise on this subject. The Catholic Church is the Mystical Body of Christ, and the older school theologians were quite well aware of the fact. The theology of the Mystical Body is that portion of sacred doctrine in which we find the scientific exposition of the revealed message about the connection of the Catholic Church with our Lord. The school theologians knew and taught the theology of the Mystical Body. A complete theological treatise on the Mystical Body is one in which all the theological elements pertinent to the Church's union with our Lord are brought together and compared, for the sake of a still more perfect and profound understanding of the mystery. The complete theological treatise on the Mystical Body is one of the glories of our own day. It would be naïve in the extreme to blame earlier theologians for not having done what has been distinctively a twentieth century work.

---

[3] Cf. DB 1796.

The theses which have formed the school theology on the Catholic Church since the first part of the eighteenth century were developed in scientific theological form by the classical ecclesiologists from Cardinal John de Turrecremata to Francis Sylvius (1649). As a group these men devoted great attention to the teaching on the Mystical Body. Some of them, like the brilliant controversialist John Eck (1543) and Cardinal Hosius made the formula "Body of Christ" serve as a definition of the Church.[4] All of them joined the term "Mystical Body of Christ" to a great number of other designations, all of which served as names and figures of the Catholic Church. The classical ecclesiologists used all of these names in their proofs. The term "Body of Christ" in any one of a dozen variants occupied one of the most prominent positions among these names.

These names or figures listed and used by the schoolmen were designations, both proper and metaphorical, found in the Scriptures or in the Fathers, and applied to the Catholic Church. Some of them, like *Ager* and *Convivium* were taken from our Lord's parables of the Kingdom. Others, as for example *Corpus*, *Columna* and *Firmamentum* are found in St. Paul's epistles. Still others, like *Amica* and *Fons* came from Old Testament passages which the Fathers applied to the Church.

In the writings of the classical ecclesiologists all of these names or figures of the Church played an important role. They were not used merely to show the affection of the writers for our Lord's Church. They entered into the proof and the explanation of the various theses about the Church. Thus the classical ecclesiologists employed the titles *Navis*, *Sponsa* and *Arca* in presenting the thesis *Extra Ecclesiam*

---

[4] Cf. Hosius, *Confessio Catholicae Fidei Christiana*, cap. 20. In the *Opera Omnia*, Vol. I, p. 28; also Eck, *Enchiridion Locorum Communium*, Venice, 1533, p. 1 recto.

nulla salus. The names *Sagena* and *Area* were used to show that sinners as well as righteous men were to be found in the ranks of the Church Militant. The visibility of the Church was attested in passages which spoke of it as *Civitas* and *Mons.* In each case the classical ecclesiologist took either the passage in Scripture referring directly to the Church or the patristic statement in which a scriptural text was appropriated to the Church and employed this statement in proposing his own thesis.

There were a great many of these names. Turrecremata[5] explains twenty five of them and Francis Sonnius (1576)[6] eighteen. Thomas Stapleton (1598), Francis Suarez (1617), St. Robert Bellarmine (1621) and Francis Sylvius (1649) all employ over forty of them. Each name was used to show the existence of one definite set of characteristics in the Catholic Church. The very multitude of these names tended to protect these classical theologians against the temptation to carry any single analogy to extravagant lengths. They could not easily forget that the same organization which St. Paul called the Body of Christ had been compared by our Lord to a net in which both good and bad fishes were enclosed. The Church which was called the garden enclosed was also known as the sheepfold of Christ, containing those sheep over whom our Lord had set His vicar on earth. As a result we look in vain through the writings of these classical school theologians for the errors relative to the Mystical Body reproved in the *Mystici Corporis.*

Nevertheless the name Mystical Body was a vital factor in the writings of the classical theologians. In the days of the classical ecclesiologists the most important controversies in the treatise *De Ecclesia* hinged upon various ways of interpreting the term Body of Christ. These theological differences were settled in a scholarly way, without the acerbity that marked the debates about efficacious grace. As a result they are not as well known as the dispute between the Thomists and the Molinists, even though they contributed a great deal towards our theology of the Catholic Church. The principals in these discussions are among the best theologians in the history of ecclesiology.

The first of these controversies had to do with the designation of member of the Church. The name Mystical Body of Christ indicates the Church as receiving a vital influx from our Lord. The great Dominican Cardinal John de Turrecremata considered a member as a living part of a living organism. As a result he refused the title of member to Catholics in the state of mortal sin. Although sinners as well as righteous men could belong to the Church or be parts of the Catholic Church, they had no right to the dignity and the designation of members.[7]

---

[5] Cf. *Summa de Ecclesia,* Venice, 1560. Lib. I, cap. 1–2, 8, 31–43.

[6] Cf. *Demonstrationes Religionis Christianae ex Verbo Dei,* Louvain, 1556, Tract. 8, cap. 1, pp. 447–53.

The restricted use of the term member continued for some time. Theoretically St. Robert Bellarmine did not approve of it,[8] but in practice he habitually spoke of sinful Catholics as being within the Church rather than as members of this society. Gregory of Valentia (1603) rightly considered that this difference with reference to the title of member was a matter of slight importance.[9] Adam Tanner (1632)[10] and Francis Sylvius[11] finally rejected Turrecremata's terminology since it rested upon an unwarranted analogical use of the word member.

Like Turrecremata and like the other classical ecclesiologists, James Latomus taught that the Mystical Body of Christ is the actually existing Catholic Church. However the great Louvain controversialist believed that the title Mystical Body belonged primarily to the group living the life of charity within that Church. The actually existing Catholic Church, the *Ecclesia permixta*, possesses all of her spiritual resources and dignities by reason of the righteous among her members. Thus, according to Latomus, the *Ecclesia permixta* is properly though not primarily designated as the Body of Christ.[12] Alphonsus a Castro (1559) drew a somewhat similar distinction between the names *Corpus Christi* and *Ovile Christi*.[13] St. Robert

---

[7] Cf. *Summa de Ecclesia*, Lib. I, cap. 57, pp. 68 verso–69 verso.

[8] Cf. *Disputationes Roberti Bellarmini Politiani, Societatis Iesu De Controversiis Christianae Fidei Adversus Huius Temporis Haereticos.* Ingolstadt, 1586, Vol. I, *Quarta Controversia Generalis. De Conciliis et Ecclesia Militante*, Liber III, *De Ecclesia Militante*, cap. 9, col. 1290.

[9] Cf. *Commentaria Theologica*, Ingolstadt, 1603, Vol. III, Disp. I, *De Obiecto Fidei*, Quaest. I, Punct. 7, No. 16, col. 168–69.

[10] Cf. *Theologia Scholastica*, Ingolstadt, 1627, Tom. III. Disp. I, *De Fide*, Quaest. III, dub. 2, col. 135.

[11] Cf. *Libri Sex de Praecipuis Fidei Nostrae Orthodoxae Controversiis Cum Nostris Haereticis*, Liber III, *De Ecclesia*, Quaest. I, Art. 10. (In the *Opera Omnia*, Antwerp, 1698, Vol. V, pp. 252–53.)

[12] Cf. *De Ecclesia et Humanae Legis Obligatine*, in the *Opera*, Louvain, 1550, cap. 2–3. pp. 93 verso and 94 recto.

[13] Cf. *Adversus Omnes Haereses Libri Quatuordecim.* In the *Opera*, Paris, 1571, Lib. I, cap. 8, col. 54.

Bellarmine's teaching on the unity of the Church was instrumental in turning the school theology away from this manner of interpreting the doctrine of the Mystical Body.

The far-reaching controversy relative to the proper definition of the Church militant of the New Testament was likewise decided in the light of the name *Corpus Mysticum.* Some of the classical ecclesiologists, notably Suarez and Sylvius,[14] were convinced that an occult heretic should not be numbered among those who belong to the Catholic Church. Basing their argument upon the fact that the Church is the Body of Christ, they reasoned that a man who belongs to the Church should have some part of that life. Since faith is the fundamental act in the supernatural order, they concluded that the man who rejected the faith received no vital influx from Christ and hence should not be considered as a member of the Church.

Thus they insisted upon defining the Church as the society of those who actually have the divine faith, rather than as the congregation of those who profess that faith.[15] A good number of early school theologians used that type of definition.

Other theologians, among them St. Peter Canisius (1597) St. Robert Bellarmine and Gregory of Valentia, preferred to define the Church in function of the profession of faith rather than in terms of the divine faith itself. These theologians also used the concept of the Mystical Body to substantiate their own conclusions. They distinguished two ways in which the members of the Mystical Body are connected with our Lord. They spoke of an external and an internal communication within the Church and they held that the external communication alone was sufficient to constitute a man as a member of the Church. Thus the occult heretic, lacking the inward bonds of faith and charity, could still be numbered within the ranks of the Church Militant through his possession of the external communication.[16]

The *Mystici Corporis* speaks of these two bonds of union with Christ and describes them as St. Robert Bellarmine did in his *De Ecclesia Militante.* It is interesting to note that in the *De Ecclesia Militante* the inward and outward bonds of unity with our Lord are designated under the names of the soul and the body of the Church.[17] Years before St. Robert, James Latomus had fully described these two bonds of unity and had designated them as the spiritual and the bodily communication with the Church.[18] St. Robert simply took the distinction which Latomus had employed to show the effects of excommunication and used that distinction to show that even occult heretics might be truly within the Body which is the Church of Jesus Christ, in as much as they possess a real, though external bond of unity with the head of that Church. Catholic Theology since his day has accepted his argument and his definition. It has thereby approved his use of the *Corpus Mysticum.*

---

[14] Cf. Suarez, *Opus de Triplici Virtute Theologica,* Lyons, 1621. Tract. I, Disp. IX, Sectio I, no. 24, p. 162; also Sylvius, *op. cit.,* Quaest, I, art. 7, pp. 242–44.

[15] Suarez defined the Church as "the entire congregation of faithful men believing in Christ." (*op. cit.,* Sectio I, no. 1, p. 156.) Sylvius defined the Church militant of the New Testament as "the society of faithful men ordered and united under one head, Christ and under His Vicar on earth, the Roman Pontiff." (*op. cit.,* Quaest. I, art. 2, p. 237.)

[16] Cf. St. Robert, *op. cit.,* Cap. X, cols. 1296–1306; also Gregory of Valentia, *op. cit.,* no. 14, col. 166.

The concept of the Mystical Body enters into most of the theses of the *De Ecclesia Militante* as a proof or an explanation of St. Robert's teaching. The other names of the Church are used with it. St. Robert, like the other classical ecclesiologists, never permitted himself to forget that the institution he was describing and defending was the society which St. Paul had described as Christ's Body. As a result the theses of the classical theology on the Catholic Church are conclusions formulated and developed in the light of the Mystical Body concept. These were the theses which entered and remained in the school theology *De Ecclesia Christi.* Whatever else it may have done, that school theology certainly did not neglect the doctrine of the Mystical Body.

At least one misconception which crept into the works of some theologians after the time of St. Robert and his fellows came from an unregulated application of the Body-analogy rather than from any failure to consider it. A good number of subsequent theologians, impressed by St. Robert's use of the terms body and soul of the Church, hastened to include them in their own writings. Unfortunately however they neglected the purpose for which St. Robert had employed these terms. Thus the body and the soul of the Church came ultimately to be considered as societies in some way distinct from one another instead of what they had been in the *De Ecclesia Militante*, factors by which men were joined together in the unity of the Catholic Church.

It took well over a century and a half to complete this twisting of St. Robert Bellarmine's teaching. The process however began with a contemporary of the great Controversialist. In his immensely popular seminary manual, the *Breviarium Theologicum*, John Polman (1649) merely copied what St. Robert had set down about the soul and the body of the Church without giving any hint of the purpose for which these terms had been used.[19] The casual reader of Polman would hardly suspect that his terms referred to factors which had long been known in ecclesiology as the inward and the outward bonds of unity within the visible Church of Jesus Christ.

---

[17] St. Robert, *op. cit.*, cap. II, col. 1264.

[18] *Ad Oecolampadium Responsio.* In the *Opera*, pp. 131 verso and 132 recto.

A more seriously confused use of St. Robert's terminology on the Mystical Body entered some manuals of school theology through the writings of Charles du Plessis d'Argentré (1740) and Honoratus Tournely (1729). D'Argentré, whose *Elementa Theologica* appeared some years earlier than the *Praelectiones Theologicae de Ecclesia Christi* of his older Sorbonne confrere, used the concept of the Mystical Body for his fundamental teaching on the Church. "So great is the analogy between the Mystical Body of the Church and the natural human body that you can easily understand the essence and the properties of the former through the latter."[20]

D'Argentré could never be accused of neglecting the concept of the Mystical Body. However he was somewhat careless in handling his analogy, and failed to check his teachings properly with the dicta of traditional theology. He paid comparatively little attention to the other names of the Church. As a result he drew inferences quite at variance with the pronouncements of his predecessors.

He was among the first to suggest that the Church could be defined in function of what St. Robert had named the soul of the Church,[21] despite the fact that St. Robert himself had brought up the concept of the inward bond of unity and applied the name soul to it precisely in order to show that it should not be an element in such a definition. Furthermore, at the hands of D'Argentré, this inward communication became *the* soul of the Church, a basic factor in several faulty explanations. He used the visible Church itself, rather than the external bond of unity as the co-relative of this soul[22] and taught that catechumens who died before being received into the Church might be saved through belonging to its soul.[23]

---

[19] *Breviarium Theologicum*, Paris, 1682, no. 124, p. 206.

[20] *Elementa Theologica*, Paris, 1702, cap. VII, p. 161.

[21] *Op. cit.*, p. 164.

[22] *Op. cit.*, p. 161.

[23] *Op. cit.*, p. 166.

Tournely listed a great number of names and figures of the Church. In his theses however, the name Mystical Body is used more than the others. The same tendencies which appear in D'Argentré's work are manifest in his. As a matter of fact, Tournely went further astray than had his younger colleague. Where D'Argentré had suggested a definition of the Church in function of the soul, Tournely actually offered such a definition.[24] Furthermore Tournely was much more effective in popularizing this confusion. Hurter's *Nomenclator Literarius* lists D'Argentré's *Elementa Theologica* as a rare book.[25] Tournely's manuals were among the most popular handbooks in the history of theological education.

Where Tournely had simply offered a definition of the Church in terms of the soul, the brilliant German Jesuit Heinrich Kilber (1783) made a triple definition of the Church the basis of his ecclesiology. Two of Kilber's formulae describe the Church "inadequately," one in function of the soul alone, and the other in function of the body alone. The inadequate definition in the light of the body is similar to St. Robert's definition of the Church itself. The definition which described the Church "adequately" took in both the soul and the body.[26] The famous Sorbonne theologian Louis Legrand (1780) finally defined the soul of the Church as a society in some manner distinct from the visible Church itself.[27]

Although some few school texts incorporated Legrand's teaching about the soul of the Church into their treatises *De Ecclesia*, this misapplication of the Mystical Body concept was never very influential among the Scholastics. Popularizers rather than proponents of the school theology employed it. The school theology as a whole continued the theses of the classical ecclesiologists, theses constructed in the light of an accurate Mystical Body teaching. The school theology since the middle ages prepared the way for the *Mystici Corporis*.

Washington, D. C. JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON.

---

[24] *Praelectiones Theologicae De Ecclesia Christi*, Secunda editio, Paris, 1739, p. 23.

[25] *Nomenclator Literarius*, Editio tertia, Innsbruck, 1910, col. 1004.

[26] *Principia Theologica*. In the *RR. Patrum Societatis Jesu Theologia Dogmatica, Polemica, Scholastica et Moralis Praelectionibus Publicis in Alma Universitate Wirceburgensi Accommodata*, Editio tertia, pp. 86–87.

[27] *De Ecclesia*. Included in Migne's *Theologiae Cursus Completus*, Vol. IV, col. 25.

Answers to Questions

THE COLOR OF THE ANTEPENDIUM

Question: The Antependium—*Pallium Altaris*—is supposed to correspond in color to the feast of the day or the office; before the Blessed Sacrament exposed it is to be white. Now, when the altar has been properly adorned for a feast, e.g., the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, does the red antependium have to be removed for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament during the afternoon? Or, again, what should be the color of the antipendium on the Vigil of Pentecost when the Ordo notes—Alb. in Off., Viol. in Bened. Fontis, Rub. in Miss.?

Answer: Our correspondent is quite correct in his general statement that the antependium should correspond in color with the office and Mass of the day. White, however, is always to be used when the Blessed Sacrament is solemnly exposed, even though a different color is prescribed for the vestments of the Mass. Thus, if the Forty Hours' Adoration opens on Pentecost Sunday, a day which excludes the Votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament, the vestments should be red but the antependium white.

In the *casus* proposed, on the Feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, the red antependium should be replaced by a white one for Benediction in the afternoon. In any case, white is the color for the Vespers of that day, as the day following is the Feast of the Seven Sorrows. For the Vigil of Pentecost, authors generally (v. g. Martinucci, *Lib. II*, *Cap. XXXI*, *6*) direct that the violet antependium be placed over the red one, the former to be removed just before the Mass. No attention is paid to the white color designated in the *Ordo* for the Office, the Little Hours being recited with the altar hung with its violet antependium. (Cf. Martinucci *et al.*)

William J. Lallou.

HOSPITAL PROBLEMS

Question 1: May the authorities of a Catholic hospital permit a Jewish rabbi to perform the rite of circumcision on a child in the hospital?

Question 2: When a pregnant woman is suffering a severe hemorrhage from the uterus, is a curettage allowed? Many doctors say that in such circumstances it is very probable that the child is dead, and that the certain right of the mother to life prevails over the probable-at-best right of the child.

Answer 1: Generally speaking, the authorities of a Catholic hospital would seem to be justified in allowing the religious ceremony of circumcision to take place in the hospital. As far as the rite itself is concerned, their attitude must be mere toleration; they may take no active part. There would usually be some material cooperation involved in the granting of a room for the ceremony, the arranging of chairs, etc. However, such remote co-operation would ordinarily be justified by the fact that a refusal to permit the ceremony would entail unpleasant consequences, such as hard feelings, retaliations on Catholics, the loss of patronage to the hospital, etc. For this reason it seems quite customary for those conducting Catholic hospitals to tolerate in their buildings Jewish and other non-Catholic religious rites.

Answer 2: It is ordinarily not permitted to perform a curettage (emptying of the womb) on a pregnant mother suffering a hemorrhage, in the event that the fetus is non-viable, unless the doctor is morally certain that the fetus is dead. This would be using a bad means—an action which would directly kill the child—to produce a good effect. Even if it is only probable that the child is still alive, the operation may not be performed. For this is one of the cases in which the use of probabilism is forbidden—where an objective evil is liable to come to a human being if a probable opinion is followed. However, one exception is to be noted. If it is certain that there has been a complete breaking off of the placenta, a curettage would be permissible, since in such a case the condition of the fetus would be no worse outside the womb than within it. In fact, in such an event a curettage would permit the administration of baptism, if the fetus is still alive.

The case is stated thus in the *Handbook of Medical Ethics*, by La Rochelle and Fink (p. 109):—"Curettage is allowed . . . if the death of the fetus is certain. In case of a very bad hemorrhage accidentally brought on by the complete breaking off of the placenta and before viability has been reached, curettage is allowed also, as the fetus probably died ten minutes or so after the accident, and it would then be necessary to remove it. However, since things do not always happen so quickly and there cannot be absolute certainty at a given moment, the fetus must be removed with great care, to avoid embryotomy, so that there may be nothing more than a change of place, after which baptism must be considered. . . . A partial breaking away does not necessarily mean the death of the fetus".

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

CONCERNING CHRISTMAS MASSES

Question 1: May a priest say three Masses consecutively in the chapel of a religious house on Christmas, beginning at midnight, so that he is finished before 2 A.M.?

Question 2: What is to be said of a priest who celebrated the three Masses of Christmas in this manner:—At midnight he said the first Mass, *Dominus dixit*, in the parish church; at nine o'clock he said another public Mass in the same place, taking the third Mass in the Missal, *Puer natus est nobis*; afterward he said privately the second Mass, *Lux fulgebit?* He defends this change of order on the grounds that the Church wishes us, as far as possible, to adapt the public Masses on Christmas to the time of celebration, and the second Mass is prescribed for dawn, whereas the third Mass is to be said in the daytime.

Answer 1: In the chapel of a religious house where the Blessed Sacrament is habitually reserved, *one* priest may say three Masses on Christmas, beginning at midnight (Can. 821, 3). The three Masses must be said consecutively, without notable interruption between them. Thus, according to Dom Augustine: "If a priest says but one Mass at midnight, he must say the other two Masses according to the rubrical time, i.e., the second not earlier than about 5.15 or 5.30 A.M., and the third after that" (*Commentary on Canon Law*, Vol. 4, p. 167).

Answer 2: The priest in question seems to have been thinking of a decision of the Sacred Congregation of Rites which prescribed that a priest who says only one or two Masses on Christmas should celebrate the Mass or Masses which correspond to the hour of celebration, according to the special rubrics of this day (S.R.C., 3354). Accordingly, if a priest says only two Masses, one at midnight and the other at nine o'clock, he appropriately says the first and the third given in the Missal. But when a priest says three Masses, he is supposed to follow the order prescribed, at whatever hour he celebrates. The inversion of the order, however, would constitute only a light transgression of the rubrics.

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

INTENTIONS OF BINATION MASSES

Question: A pastor celebrates two Masses every Sunday, the first always *pro populo*. Frequently it would be desirable if he could say the second Mass for a stipend, since the donor could thus be present, who would be unable to assist at the Mass on a weekday. May the pastor offer the second Mass for a stipend, and then on one of the following weekdays celebrate Mass without a stipend? By following such a procedure he would not actually receive more stipends than if he said the second Mass on Sunday *sine stipendio*, and a stipend Mass each of the following weekdays.

Answer: Outside of Christmas, and excluding an honorarium from an extrinsic title, the pastor may not satisfy two obligations of justice by two Masses on the same day (Canon 824, 2). The *Missa pro populo* is due in justice, and so on the same day he is forbidden to celebrate another Mass for a stipend. The fact that the priest would follow the system described in the question, and thus receive only the same number of stipends as if he observed the proper procedure, does not justify him. It is well to note, however, that if a priest has celebrated two Masses on the same day for two obligations in justice, he has failed against the law of the Church, but is not obliged to repeat either of the Masses or to restore any stipend.

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

Analecta

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE DISCIPLINA SACRAMENTORUM

EPISTULA

AD ORDINARIOS DE CUSTODIA ET PROTECTIONE SANCTISSIMAE EUCHARISTIAE ADVERSUS BELLICOS INCURSUS

Quam longe lateque immoderatus bellicus furor per universum paene orbem saeviat atque omnia pessumdet, adhibitis tormentis bellicis omne genus, tum aëriis tum maritimis tum terrestribus, nemo est qui non videat.

A tam dira armorum direptione, proh dolor, immunia non sunt ipsa quoque sacra Dei templa, quae sacrosanctum Christi Corpus sub eucharisticis Speciebus delitescens asservant.

Ad quamlibet irreverentiam, quantum fieri poterit, a Sanctissima Eucharistia arcendam, sacra haec Congregatio Ordinariorum (can. 198 § 1) mentem convertere studet ad perquirenda media accomodatiora: quamvis non ignoret nonnullos Excm̃os Praesules laudabiliter ad rem idoneas normas suis parochis ecclesiarumque rectoribus iam suppeditasse.

Quaedam idcirco hisce litteris visum est concinnare, quae Ordinariis atque presbyteris Sanctissimae Eucharistiae custodibus inserviant ad tam grave, quo adstringuntur, munus explendum.

1. Apprime sacerdotes missalis rubricam, *De def. in cel. Miss. occ.*, X, n. 2, prae oculis habeant, si incursionis nuncio percelluntur dum sacra peragunt Mysteria, quae inter alia praescribit: "Si sacerdote celebrante . . . timeatur incursus hostium vel alluvionis vel ruina loci ubi celebratur, ante consecrationem dimittatur Missa, post consecrationem vero sacerdos accelerare poterit sumptionem Sacramenti, omissis omnibus aliis."

2. Prudenti Ordinarii iudicio, spectato hostilium offensionum incumbente periculo, potestas committitur suspendendi ad tempus,

donec scilicet periculum ipsum perseveret, facultates asservandi Sanctissimam Eucharistiam in ecclesiis, quae tamen paroeciales aut praecellentes in loco non sint; et in oratoriis semipublicis, idest cappellis communitatum, seminariorum, nosocomiorum etc., ubi sacerdos aut diaconus praesto non sit, qui sacras Species in tuto collocare possit tempore incursionum; necnon praesertim in oratoriis domesticis.

3. In communitatibus tamen per sacerdotes aut moniales moderatis, quae de more semipublicum habent oratorium, si contingat quod specialis locus sit deputatus ut *refugium*, quod vocant, contra bellicas insidias communitati exclusive reservatus, qui locus sit aptus et decens, ibi pro oratorio asservari poterit etiam habitualiter Sanctissima Eucharistia, aptato altari convenienter ornato cum ciborio conopeo contecto, cum lampade electrica diu noctuque collucescente, ibique communitatis membris licebit sueta pietatis exercitia explere. Quoties autem Missa in oratorio litetur ad commodum praebendum sacrae Communionis suscipiendae, consecrentur dumtaxat particulae necessariae.

4. Ita pariter, in urbibus praefatis incursibus magis expositis, si ecclesia cryptam aut sacellum subterraneum habeat, aut facile ibi aptari possit, quod contra hostiles iniurias securitatem praeseferat, ibi Sanctissima Eucharistia potest continenter asservari in altari cum tabernaculo recondito in loco tutiore, servatis quae n. 3 diximus; et si ibi facilis pateat accessus ac suppetat loci capacitas, integrum sit fidelibus sacris functionibus interesse.

5. Canone 1269 § 3 casui prospicitur in quo "gravi aliqua suadente causa ab Ordinario loci probata, non est vetitum Sanctissimam Eucharistiam nocturno tempore extra altare ... in loco tutiore et decenti ... asservari ...." Hoc iuris praescriptum iam expendimus in Instructione *De Sanctissima Eucharistia sedulo custodienda* diei 26 maii 1938 ad 5:[1] ubi tali asservationis modo magis consuli dicebatur securitati Sanctissimae Eucharistiae praesertim adversus fures: at hoc valere etiam in bellicis offensionibus evidens est, et quidem etiam diurno tempore, si necesse sit.

Hic locus tutior potest esse etiam specialis aliquis recessus, subter ecclesiam aut sacrarium vel in paroeciali domo, potissimum si sacrae Species includantur in quadam arca ferrea, artificum iudicio construenda ut ab igne, umore aliaque offensione protegatur, imis ecclesiae muris aut intimo marmoreo columnae stylobati inserenda, servatis, quantum fieri poterit, legibus liturgicis atque citata Instructione.

---

[1] *Acta A. Sedis*, Vol. XXX, pag. 98 seqq.

6. Aliquando praestabit, uti iam innuimus n. 3, tot dumtaxat singulis diebus consecrari hostias quot sufficiant fidelibus sacra Dape sese refecturis, consumptis iis quae forte inde superfuerint, praeter eas quae viatico aut communioni infirmis ministrandis reserventur, et hae suadetur ut collocentur non in ordinaria pyxide, sed in theca quadam ex solido metallo confecta, omnino obstructa, decenti iuxta morem, facilius recondenda et transferenda.

Sacerdos vero, qui prope ecclesiam incolit, incursionis tempore praefatam thecam cum sacris Particulis ita reservatis arripiat et in locum tutum deferat.

7. Valde autem expediet ut parochus edoceat aliquos fideles, prudentia ac pietate praestantes—in primis sodales confraternitatis Sanctissimi Sacramenti, cuius praecipue est curam Sanctissimae Eucharistiae exhibere et cultum promovere—in extrema necessitate, nempe si parochus aut sacerdos in loco desit et periculum profanationis Sanctissimae Eucharistiae immineat, Sacras Species in loco tuto ponere aut forte deperditas quam diligentissime requirere et colligere.

8. Hae, quae recensuimus, quaedam dumtaxat sunt normae ad enunciatum finem attingendum; his vero quominus aliae addantur, quae inspectis locorum peculiaribus adiunctis magis idoneae reperiantur, nihil vetat; imo enixe Ordinairos adhortamur ut, si efficaciora comperiant media, iisdem utantur.

Gratum equidem foret huic sacrae Congregationi suo tempore ea omnia agnoscere quae Ordinarii moliti fuerint ad tuendam Sanctissimam Eucharistiam adversus bellicos incursus.

Ssm̃us Dominus Noster Pius Divina Providentia Papa XII, in Audientia Excm̃o Secretario huius S. Congregationis die 14 septembris 1943 concessa, praefatam epistulam, ab EE. PP. in Plenariis Conventibus maturo ac diligenti examini iam subiectam, approbare dignatus est ac publici iuris fieri iussit in Commentario Officiali *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* et exsecutioni illico demandari; cum derogationibus necessariis et opportunis.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus Sacrae Congregationis de disciplina Sacramentorum, die 15 mensis Septembris anni 1943.

✠ D. CARD. JORIO, *Praefectus.*

L. ✠ S. F. BRACCI, *Secretarius.*

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

BRIXIEN.

BEATIFICATIONIS ET CANONIZATIONIS VENERABILIS SERVI DEI INNOCENTII A BERTIO, SACERDOTIS PROFESSI ORDINIS MINORUM CAPUCCINORUM

SUPER DUBIO

An constet de virtutibus theologalibus Fide, Spe, Caritate tum in Deum cum in proximum, nec non cardinalibus Prudentia, Iustitia, Temperantia, Fortitudine earumque adnexis in gradu heroico in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur.

[Pater Beatissimus] edixit: *Constare de virtutibus theologalibus Fide, Spe, Caritate cum in Deum, tum in proximum nec non de cardinalibus Prudentia, Iustitia, Temperantia, Fortitudine earumque adnexis Venerabilis Innocentii a Bertio in gradu heroico in casu et ad effectum, de quo agitur.*

Hoc autem decretum publici iuris fieri et in acta S. Rituum Congregationis referri mandavit.

Datum Romae, die 21 Martii a. D. 1943.

✠ C. CARD. SALOTTI, Ep. Praen., *Praefectus.*

L. ✠ S.

A. CARINCI, *Secretarius.*

MATRITEN.

BEATIFICATIONIS ET CANONIZATIONIS VENERABILIS SERVAE DEI VINCENTIAE MARIAE LÓPEZ Y VICUÑA, FUNDATRICIS INSTITUTI FILIARUM MARIAE IMMACULATAE PRO PUELLIS FAMULATUI ADDICTIS

SUPER DUBIO

An constet de virtutibus theologalibus Fide, Spe, Caritate tum in Deum cum in proximum nec non de cardinalibus Prudentia, Iustitia, Temperantia, Fortitudine earumque adnexis in gradu heroico in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur.

[Pater Beatissimus] edixit: *Constare de virtutibus theologalibus Fide, Spe, Caritate cum in Deum tum in proximum nec non de cardinalibus Prudentia, Iustitia, Temperantia, Fortitudine earumque adnexis Venerabilis Vincentiae Mariae López y Vicuña in gradu heroico in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur.*

Hoc autem decretum promulgari et ad acta S. Rituum Congregationis referri mandavit.

Datum Romae, die 21 Martii a. D. 1943.

✠ C. Card. Salotti, Ep. Praen., *Praefectus*.

L. ✠ S. A. Carinci, *Secretarius*.

RECENT PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS ANNOUNCED IN THE ACTA APOSTOLICAE SEDIS

Papal Chamberlains Supernumerary to His Holiness:

July 29, 1943: Very Rev. Msgr. Hubert Anthony Lerschen, of the Diocese of Lafayette; Very Rev. Msgr. James E. Howard, of the Diocese of Alexandria.

August 12, 1943: Very Rev. Msgr. Anthony Carroll Badeaux, Very Rev. Msgr. H. Joseph Jacobi, and Very Rev. Msgr. Edward Charles Prendergast, of the Archdiocese of New Orleans.

Book Reviews

PHILOSOPHIES AT WAR. By Fulton J. Sheen. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943. Pp. 200. $2.00.

Msgr. Sheen within the comparatively brief compass of his *Philosophies at War* has given an accurate and searching diagnosis and a clear exposition of the causes underlying the present universal madness which we call World War II. The book is at once a diagnosis and a challenge. The reader will find here a clear-cut and forceful indictment of the false philosophies and erroneous creeds that have brought civilization to the brink of disaster; errors which are the underlying causes of the present war and the equally present revolution. The book, as the title indicates, is chiefly concerned with the revolution.

The war now being waged on land, sea and in the air is but the outward feature of the revolution which is a war on a more extensive front because it is a war of ideas. When hostilities have ceased in the many battle areas this conflict of ideologies will still confront us. "A far more important question than 'Who will win the war?' is the question: 'Who will win the revolution?' " The author with pointed emphasis sounds a warning against the all-too-common fallacy that there are only two philosophies of life involved in the conflict, the Democratic and Totalitarian, or Christian and non-Christian. There is another, the Secularist view, humanistic and democratic, but without religious and moral foundation. It is this Secularist view, embracing Materialism, Relativism, Scientism, the cult of Progress and of License, which is the enemy within our own walls and hence the more dangerous.

Msgr. Sheen gives the only answer which can be given to the question, "Whether man is a tool of the state as Totalitarianism believes; or whether man is an animal as the Secularist tradition of the Western World and many Americans believe; or whether man is a creature made to the image and likeness of God, as the Christian believes." When this third element of the triple question has been answered by a sincere affirmative, then we can dare hope for the world. Here is the challenge. "Our task is not the restoration of everything as it was.... It is regeneration we are seeking." This regeneration will come through the practical realization of the absolute value of Christian principles; by restoring these principles to the home, the class-room, and the workshop.

DANIEL O'C. MCFADDEN, S.J.

COMMENTARIUS IN SUMMAM D. THOMAE DE DEO UNO ET TRINO. By Augustus Ferland, S.S., S.T.D., Ph.D. Montréal, Canada, Grand Séminaire, Faculté de Théologie, 1943. Pp. XIX + 451. $2.00.

It is gratifying to have a treatise such as this fall into one's hands in these lean years of theological production. Scientific books on theology and manuals of this type have been scarce in the past years as a result of the disrupted conditions of the world.

Dr. Ferland has already published in this series a commentary on *De Verbo Incarnato et Redemptore*, 1936; *De Gratia*: *De Sacramentis in Communi*, 1938; *De Sacramentis in Speciali: De Novissimis*, 1940. The present volume contains a general introduction to theology. In it the formal object of theology, its character as a science, its excellence, divisions, method and sources are briefly considered and present a good approach to the whole domain of theology. The work proper comprises two parts as the title of the book suggests: the one on the existence, nature and attributes of the one God, and the other on the doctrine of the triune God.

Dr. Ferland follows the methods generally adopted by current manuals on dogmatic theology, with a preponderance of reason and the metaphysical. In problems disputed among the schools, e.g., as to the manner in which God effects acts in rational creatures, as to God's knowledge of futuribles, as to problems of predestination and reprobation, the author wholeheartedly espouses thomistic views. In these questions Thomistic theology has found its best expression in recent years as far as a manual presentation of them for the seminarian is concerned.

The work has many qualities of a recommendable textbook. A practical innovation occurring throughout the pages of the book is the graphic presentation of theological concepts with their divisions and subdivisions in the form of diagrams, so that in one view one is readily able to envisage all the various notions which can possibly be involved and to distinguish them from those not applicable to the matter at hand.

It must be regretted that in a manual intended for seminaries, especially on this continent, not sufficient cognizance is taken of the proofs from Sacred Scripture. Some bare texts are usually given, but they are scanty and do not allow us a broader view of the contents of the Work of God on the given topic.

STANISLAUS J. GRABOWSKI.

FORBIDDEN SUNDAY AND FEAST-DAY OCCUPATIONS. By Rev. Vincent J. Kelly, C.SS.R., S.T.D. Washington, D. C., The Catholic University of America Press (Studies in Sacred Theology, No. 70), 1943. Pp. xiii + 219. $2.00.

This recent dissertation is a splendid addition to the Studies in Sacred Theology which the Catholic University is publishing. It is a thoroughly scientific, yet remarkably readable work. In it one will find a full and a satisfying treatment of almost every aspect of this positive Church obligation of Sunday and holy day rest.

The author deserves considerable praise for his exposition of the law touching court proceedings, buying and selling on Sundays and Feast-days; for his treatment of the subject of the precept, of the norm for judging the gravity of sin in these matters, and of the causes which excuse from its obligation. He has brought together the teachings of all the moralists, both ancient and very modern, to give firm foundation to his decisions. The reader will get from all this a renewed and re-integrated view of the Third Commandment as it touches the obligation of rest.

One feels that the central portion of Fr. Kelly's dissertation is to be found in his treatment of the nature of servile work and in the definition which he presents. Here Father Kelly has walked into the midst of a moralist's 'no-man's-land'. Like many another he has realized the inadequacy of the manuals on this point; he has seen the need of bringing the norm and notion of servile works into full contact with the changed conditions of modern times; and, no doubt, he has felt with many others that the traditional norm based on the nature of the work seems insufficient to decide many modern problems, such as knitting, hobbies, recreational gardening, etc. With this in mind, he subjects the notion of servile work to a searching analysis in the light of theologians from St. Thomas to today; then he puts forth his own conclusion.

Rightly enough, the author finds two trends or two definitions of servile works in this search. First is the traditional definition beginning principally from St. Thomas, and continuing in Suarez, Cajetan, the Salmanticenses and Busembaum. This line of thought accepts a definition of servile work based on the internal nature of the works themselves, considered independently of the aim for which they are performed. The second trend or definition came to look more to the motive of the worker for the deciding element in this matter. St. Bonaventure was one of the first of this line, and, periodically since then, others have accepted this trend.

Fr. Kelly holds for a norm extrinsic to the nature of the work. He would prohibit on Sunday "the work which one does for a livelihood" (p. 114). This is almost drastically new. He favors abandoning the old traditional norm because 1) changes in time and conditions, industrial and otherwise, demand new thought on the subject of servile works; 2) this new norm is used, in practice, by very many people, and even by priests, to decide what is forbidden on Sunday; 3) the new norm provides an easy rule for deciding such disputed works as recreational gardening, knitting, etc. Such a norm, because it differs from the traditional norm, will lead to conclusions also differing from the traditional conclusions.

It is the opinion of this reviewer that Fr. Kelly's solution will not be accepted in its full extent by many. Admittedly it solves some disputes in easy fashion. Admittedly, too, the traditional norm must be brought up to date with modern conditions. Yet it will be felt that the author goes too far in discarding the old norm completely. One wonders, for example, if the worker who labors in the factory all week might build a house on Sunday and yet not violate the law of forbidden works. Perhaps a modification of this new norm would be accepted more generally, viz. if it be proposed as a supplement to the traditional norm, for application in cases of many modern and doubtful works. This reviewer, at least, will not feel free to accept it beyond that limit.

WALTER W. CURTIS.

THE RIGHTS OF MAN AND NATURAL LAW. By Jacques Maritain, translated by Doris C. Anson. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943. Pp. 119. Price $1.50.

To contrast the title of this recent work by M. Maritain with the brevity of the book leads the reader to expect that *The Rights of Man and Natural Law* is much more a series of principles and inferences than a reasoned argument, with evidence, to prove them. And this is what the volume turns out to be. Professor Maritain writes that it is his purpose to "induce those who read these pages to clarify their ideas upon a fundamental question of political philosophy—the question of the relationship between the person and society, and the rights of the human person." No one can discredit such an objective; nor can any one justly doubt that in many quarters this question needs clarification. But, in spite of the cogency of the author's thought, and its able translation into English, the question can be asked whether this essay is likely to achieve its laudable purpose.

The problems the author touches upon are multiple and profound: the person and society, Totalitarianism and what is called Personalism, and then on to a conception of society termed "a vitally Christian society," freedom, progress, law, authority and rights. All this and more passes before the reader—not indeed without logical coherence but in such a kaleidoscopic fashion that he is likely to be left confused and, what is more important, unconvinced.

For readers who begin *The Rights of Man and Natural Law* already in general agreement with the author, the book has significant worth. It is an attractive and penetrating synthesis of Christian thought, sometimes expressed with refreshing novelty and almost always with delicate clarity. Yet it is not merely a restatement of traditional truths. The author is dealing with a critical contemporary issue when he insists that the "important thing . . . is to distinguish the apocryphal from the authentic, a clerical or decoratively Christian state from a vitally and truly Christian political society. Every attempt at a clerical or decoratively Christian state . . . every attempt at a pharisaically Christian State is sure in the world of today to become the victim, the prey or the instrument of anti-Christian totalitarianism." (p. 23) And when he goes on to indicate the role of the Catholic Church in modern democratic society (pp. 25–29) M. Maritain is touching on a subject which the nature of our own government as well as the avowed tendencies of the times make highly important.

Whether professor Maritain's book will convert many readers to a clearer understanding of the relationships between the person and society is problematical. That men should get such a clearer understanding is highly desirable, and consequently the author's efforts in that direction are not only provocative but decidedly praiseworthy.

JOSEPH B. MCALLISTER, S.S.

FROM A MORNING PRAYER. By John M. Haffert. New York, The Scapular Press, 1943. Pp. xiii + 151. $2.00.

The author recalls the story of his youth in order to explain the events leading to the Scapular Apostolate in which he is now engaged. In a touching way, he tells about his frustrated vocation to the priesthood in a religious order, of the many delusions and disappointments in readjusting himself to the suddenly changed conditions, of his searching for the "right door."

The rather strange title of the book is explained by the fact that, while still a religious, he had received from a saintly lay brother "a morning offering for a Scapular Apostolate . . . an apostolate to draw men to the Sacred Heart, through Mary, without words." This same idea had been formulated by the author himself, the day before, when, as he says, "I heard words coming from my mouth that were not in my mind!" The following night, that same lay brother had a dream. The author interprets that dream as symbolic of his apostolate. In fact he calls it a vision,—a message to be delivered to the world. This book is written with the purpose of delivering that message.

The book proves that the author lacks a sound theological training. His apostolate of the Scapular *without words* has reduced the obligations to a minimum that would satisfy any quietistic author. He has created a "science of the scapular", has conducted a two-years course in *Scapularia*! He uses expressions like this: "To Jesus in the Eucharist, through Mary in the Scapular." Is Mary really present in the Scapular?

PASCAL P. PARENTE.

ANGEL OF THE ANDES. The Story of Saint Rose of Lima. By Mary Fabyan Windeatt. Paterson, N. J., St. Anthony Guild Press, 1943. Pp. IX + 133. $1.50.

This story of St. Rose of Lima was written primarily for children, but even the adult will find it gratifying and inspiring. The hagiographer who writes for children must possess the ability to adapt biographical facts to the mind, heart, and imagination of the young reader. An objective and critical presentation of historical events may satisfy the adult and the scholar; a young mind would be bored by it. The author of *Angel of the Andes* possesses this ability, or art, in an eminent degree. The life of St. Rose of Lima is most charming in itself. The author has added to the natural and supernatural beauty of this life the charm and beauty of her style, the color of her descriptions, the interest of people and places.

The several graceful illustrations (by Sister M. Jane, O.P.) that adorn the thirteen chapters and the cover of the book are in perfect harmony with the charm of the narrative, the innocence and sweetness of the subject.

The teacher of Religion in the grammar school will find this book of great assistance in illustrating lessons of the catechism with anecdotes from the story of the Angel of the Andes.

PASCAL P. PARENTE.

Book Notes

Teachers and students of homiletics, as well as priests in the ministry who desire to refresh their knowledge of the fundamentals of that art, will find a great deal to interest them in *A Primer of Homiletics*, by Rev. Thomas A. Carney, M.A., K.H.S., professor of homiletics at St. Mary's Seminary, La Porte, Texas. (Dickinson, Texas, "Sodality Distributors," Shrine of the True Cross, 1943. Pp. 143. $2.50.) Father Carney's effective and unusual presentation of the human physiognomy of "Christ, The Master Preacher," and of the characteristics of His eloquence forms an important part of the treatise. The sections devoted to structural method and rhetorical procedure and to the mechanics of public speaking are very clearly and concisely written and should be helpful to the aspiring preacher. The volume is well printed in large type, and has several blank pages for students' notes at the end. It is an outline rather than a fully developed course; perhaps for that very reason it should make a more satisfactory text-book for introductory classes in homiletics than some more ambitious volumes which are so diffusely written that the student may find them confusing.

Priests will not discover anything very new in *Christian Behaviour*, by C. S. Lewis. (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1943. Pp. 70. $1.00.) This is not to say, of course, that the book does not make interesting reading. *Christian Behaviour* is based on a series of broadcast talks given by the author over the B.B.C. In simple, non-technical language he discusses such subjects as the Cardinal Virtues, Morality and Psychoanalysis, Forgiveness, Christian Marriage, and Faith, Hope, and Charity. The chapter on Forgiveness (pp. 38–43) is especially well done, and is refreshing in these days when we are being urged to develop a violent hatred of our enemies as the only means of winning the war. Mr. Lewis is not a Catholic, of course, and his chapter on Christian Marriage rather side-steps the question of whether divorce is permissible in any circumstances. *Christian Behaviour* is not at all like the same author's *Screwtape Letters*, whose ingenious "reverse English" presentation of morality and religion from the view-point of "an elderly devil in hell" made it such an intriguing little study. The present volume has its moments of mild humor, but it is in the main a serious, straightforward treatment, with no attempt at the high satire of *Screwtape*.

The America Press deserves a vote of thanks from all lovers of good verse for reprinting *In Towns and Little Towns*, by Leonard Feeney, S.J. (New York, 1943. Pp. xi+ 113. $2.00.) The new edition contains, as an added treat, several examples of Father Feeney's later verse. To read his work is sheer delight. His light verse sings itself with a joyousness and humor which are in happy contrast to the disillusioned, frequently bitter sophistication of what passes for light verse in our "smart" magazines. Father Feeney is a poet; he never preaches in verse. But the lessons in living are there just the same, seen and expressed with all the ingenuous clarity of the children he so frequently makes his subject. One who has never looked at life in the mirror of

Father Feeney's poetry will find a gay beauty and a tender pathos he never dreamed existed in towns and little towns.

An almost unbelievable amount of pertinent information is contained in the *National Catholic Almanac for 1944.* (Paterson, N. J., St. Anthony's Guild, 1944. Pp. 800. $1.00, Cloth $1.50.) There is a detailed factual account of the life of our present Holy Father, the list of the Papal Encyclicals from the time of Pope Leo XIII to our own day (printed with the author's permission from the work of Sister Mary Claudia Carlen, I.H.M.), a valuable Catholic dictionary, and a rich store of facts about Catholic activity in the world at large, and in particular in the United States. To our mind, one of the most valuable features of the Almanac is the chronicle for the year 1943. (Pp. 673–779.) This chronicle is an unrivalled source of information about events of Catholic interest. The National Catholic Almanac is by far the most valuable Catholic hand-book appearing in the world today. It is one of the few books from which any Catholic, priest or layman, will inevitably profit. The Franciscan clerics of Holy Name College, Washington, D. C., deserve the gratitude and support of American Catholics in their enterprise.

The seventh volume in the Publications in Mediaeval Studies of the University of Notre Dame, edited by the Reverend Doctor Philip S. Moore, C.S.C. is the recently issued text of the first book of the *Sententiae Petri Pictaviensis*, prepared by Doctor Moore and by Marthe Dulong, (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1943. Pp. lxii + 326). The editors used thirty-six manuscripts in preparing this volume. They have produced a critical text which will be standard for any future reference to Peter of Poitiers. The Notre Dame Publications in Mediaeval Studies are among the most ambitious and successful projects in American Catholic scholarship. The present publication continues the long studies of Father Moore on Peter of Poitiers. The text and studies form a fit sequel to two of his previous books, *The Works of Peter of Poitiers, Master in Theology and Chancellor of Paris (1193–1205)*, and the critical text and notes for *Petri Pictaviensis allegoriae super tabernaculum Moysi,* a work in which James J. Corbett collaborated. The intense current interest in the theology of St. Thomas Aquinas should make the present volume popular with others than technical experts in the field of mediaeval theology. It is difficult in the extreme to understand the later theologians without an appreciation of the older writers, the men who made the scholastic traditions which St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure and John Duns Scotus epitomized. Few writers can equal Peter of Poitiers "the most faithful pupil of Peter Lombard" in manifesting the older scholastic tradition. The notes, particularly on the sources used by Peter, and on the relation of his teaching to that of the Master of Sentences will of course be required reading for all seminars in the history of scholastic theology. We have a great deal to learn from the teachings of the Parisian *Magistri.* The Catholic scholars of America may well be proud of Father Moore's distinguished contribution to theological science. We hope that the other four books of the *Sententiae* will soon appear.

Books Received

CLOWNS AND ANGELS. Studies in Modern French Literature. By Wallace Fowlie. New York, Sheed and Ward, 1943. Pp. 162. $2.50.

LATIN GRAMMAR. Grammar, Vocabularies, and Exercises in Preparation for the Reading of the Missal and Breviary. By Cora Carroll Scanlon, A.M. and Charles L. Scanlon, A.M. St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co., 1944. Pp. ix + 334. $3.00.

AMEN, AMEN. By S. A. Constantino, Jr. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1944. Pp. 184. $2.00.

SOBRENATURALIDAD Y LIBERTAD DE LA FE. Un estudio sobre la esencia de la primera de las virtudes teologales. Con un resumen en latin. By Eduardo Leon Bourgeois. Santiago, Chile, Imprenta de San Jose, 1942. Pp. 210.

PEACE AND RECONSTRUCTION. A Catholic Layman's Approach. By Michael O'Shaughnessy. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1943. Pp. v + 151. $2.00.

MORAL AND SOCIAL QUESTIONS. Arranged for High School Religious Discussion Groups and Study Clubs. By Alexander Wyse, O.F.M. Paterson, N. J., St. Anthony Guild Press, 1943. Pp. x + 300. $1.00.

THE PROBLEM OF PAIN. By C. S. Lewis, M.A. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1944. Pp. ix + 148. $1.50.

FATHER CONNELL'S THE NEW BALTIMORE CATECHISM No. 3. Official Revised Edition 1941 of the Baltimore Catechism No. 2, Amplified with Supplemental Questions and Answers. The Father Kinkead Memorial Edition. New York, Benziger Brothers, Inc., 1944. Pp. viii + 376. $0.50.

HOW TO THINK. By Arthur D. Fearon, Ph.D. San Francisco, The College Publishing Company, 1943. Pp. 194.

ST. THEODORE OF CANTERBURY. By William Reany, D.D. St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co., 1944. Pp. iii + 227. $2.00.

PUBLIC SPEAKING, Minimum Requirements in Sixteen Progressive Assignments. By William R. Duffey and Francis A. Duffey. St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co., 1944. Pp. v + 338. $2.50.

ONCE IN CORNWALL. Being an Account of Friar Peter's Journey in Search of the Saint and Dragon Legends of the Land. By S.M.C. of the English Dominican Congregation of Saint Catherine of Siena. New York and Toronto, Longmans Green and Co., 1944. Pp. viii + 179. $2.00.